

U. S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT

January 8, 1973

★ ★ ★

William B. Timmons, Assistant to the President for Congressional Relations, has been given greater power and new responsibilities. Under the new setup, Mr. Timmons will interview and select men to fill congressional-liaison jobs in all Cabinet departments—not just the White House. This is added evidence of how power is being concentrated at the top. Formerly, Cabinet members chose their own congressional-liaison men.

U. S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT, Jan. 8, 1973

Nixon to Upgrade Hill Liaison

By David S. Broder
Washington Post Staff Writer

President Nixon is prepared to make his most senior staff members available to groups of senators and representatives for "give-and-take" discussion of all issues that may arise in Congress this year, the head of the White House legislative liaison staff said.

The offer of extensive, informal consultations with such top presidential advisers as H.R. (Bob) Haldeman, John D. Ehrlichman, Henry A. Kissinger and Peter M. Flanigan came from William E. Timmons, the assistant to the President for congressional relations.

It was but one of several conciliatory steps outlined by Timmons in a lengthy interview last week, all designed to smooth over points of conflict that arose in the past two years between the Democratic Congress and Republican White House.

The President's top lobbyist also said Mr. Nixon would seek to upgrade departmental legislative liaison jobs to meet complaints from Congress and would publicly support congressional efforts to improve the legislative budget process.

The latter step, Timmons said, could avert any repetition of last year's bitter quarrel between Congress and the President over the control of Federal expenditures.

The 42-year-old head of the White House congressional relations staff



H. R. HALDEMAN



JOHN EHRLICHMAN



PETER FLANIGAN

... these Nixon advisers would have informal talks with congressmen.

said that Mr. Nixon was determined to do what he could to ease conflicts over executive privilege, the control of spending and the handling of legislative requests.

Of the three, the offer of informal consultations with top-level White House staffers represented perhaps the biggest step by the President to meet Capitol Hill criticisms.

Senators and Representatives of both parties have charged that Mr. Nixon has centralized decision-making

in his White House staff members, who, unlike Cabinet officials, can invoke the doctrine of executive privilege to refuse testimony to congressional committees handling legislation in their areas of responsibility.

The Senate Government Operations Committee, under its new chairman, Sen. Sam J. Ervin Jr. (D-N.C.), is expected to challenge this authority in hearings this winter.

See HILL, A16, Col. 2

HILL, From A1

Timmons said in the tape-recorded interview that Mr. Nixon "actually has not exerted executive privilege as much as other Presidents have." He said White House records indicate only three instances when congressional requests were refused on grounds of executive privilege in Mr. Nixon's first four years in office.

He also said that, without publicity, meetings had been arranged with interested legislators and such men as Daniel P. Moynihan, former counselor to the President, domestic affairs chief Ehrlichman and national security adviser Kissinger. The Kissinger sessions, he said, were held "informally at the Blair House and at Bill Fulbright's house and other places." (Sen. J. W. Fulbright of Arkansas is chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.)

Now, Timmons said, "I have a plan working" that would broaden those conferences into a program of regular "working lunches" or meetings between senior White House staff members and leading members of Congress involved with a particular issue.

"I'd like to see regular meetings, either down here or up on the Hill," he said, "with a good give-and-take issue exchange. . . . I hope we can do a lot of that this next year."

Timmons said the timing and format of the sessions had not yet been discussed with congressional leaders but that the project had the endorsement of the senior White House aides who would be involved.

Timmons specified in the interview that the meetings would have to be informal sessions, without a record or transcript, "not because there is something to hide, but because I'm afraid if it becomes a matter of record, it sets a precedent for them demanding it in the future. I think we've got to protect the President from that."

He also said the sessions could not violate "the tradition that White House staff people do not talk about personal communications with the President."

Whether meetings held under those restrictions would satisfy congressional demands for access to administration decision-making is not clear.

But Timmons said that "if they (the members of Congress) are not trying to demagogue it or trying to bring in cameras and embarrass us . . . if they are sincerely interested in trying to find out something that they feel is important," the top White House staffers would be available to them.

On the question of control of federal spending, which provoked a major

showdown with Congress at the end of the 1972 session, Timmons said "this President would be perfectly happy for Congress" to set its own budget ceiling.

"As long as it's reasonable," he said, "the President would accept that." There might still be disagreements between Congress and the Executive over the proper funding level for specific programs, but Timmons said:

"If they (the House and Senate) would get together . . . and set a ceiling based on expected income, I think the President would be very happy with that."

The congressional liaison chief said he thought the President might use the State of the Union address later this month "to prod" Congress to improve its own budgetmaking mechanism into something that would give it tighter control of fiscal policy than the existing system of more than a dozen separate appropriations bills.

"There is some resentment in Congress over the President interfering with . . . their own procedures," he acknowledged. "And I recognize that. But this area is so important . . . I would hope to see him make some statements either in the State of the Union message or in a press conference . . . urging them to come up with one."

Timmons said his own suggestion would be that the Democratic and Republican leaders of the House and Senate, the members of the House Ways and Means and Senate Finance committees and the two Appropriations Committees "get together and come up with what they feel is a proper ceiling" on spending.

"I'm talking about those that really have power . . . agreeing informally, if not formally, after consulting with the administration and the membership of House and Senate . . . and putting out a statement they could all sign, saying we think the budget for next year ought to be such-and-such a figure, based on projected income."

"They could say we have consulted and we think that such-and-such a percentage of this should be for defense, and so much for veterans, and so on, and therefore we urge the committees concerned to work within these guidelines."

Timmons called this "a practical first step" toward congressional control of spending, even if the recommendation is neither binding nor unanimous. "It would be an easy first step for them," he said, "and it would show their interest and concern" about the spending problem.

Timmons said Mr. Nixon "wants to get the best quality people in the departments' and agencies'" congressional liaison jobs "and wants them to carry a greater burden of their own legislative program load" in the next four years.

To that end, he said, the President will seek legislative authority to upgrade the congressional liaison job in each department to the assistant-secretary level. At present, he said, only the State Department and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare confer that status on their top Capitol Hill lobbyist.

Timmons said "the President feels it (the upgrading) would be helpful in attracting qualified people, in getting them involved in policy formulation, and in having them perceived as the President's men, carrying presidential commissions."

The fact that they would have to be confirmed in their jobs by the Senate would require Congress "to acknowledge that they accept these guys in their role," he added.

Timmons said that the White House "is recommending to the Cabinet officers those we think are qualified" for the proposed new jobs "and they in turn . . . will make their own determination. So far there has been no conflict . . . A Cabinet officer wouldn't want to put a congressional guy on that couldn't work with us, and certainly we wouldn't want to put a guy on that couldn't work with his Cabinet officer."

He said the names of the new departmental liaison officers would be released later.

"If we have capable people in all the departments, we feel it can take a load off of us," Timmons said. He is going into the new Congress with four of the same assistants he had last year — Richard K. Cook, Max L. Friedersdorf, Wallace H. Johnson and Tom C. Korologos. Two others who have worked with him — William Gifford and John Nidecker — have taken other assignments.

Timmons said he hoped the upgrading of the departmental liaison jobs "would ease a lot of friction that may have existed in the past. Members say such-and-such a Cabinet officer 'doesn't know who I am, and I serve on his committee.' Well, that's bad."

"By the end of June, I will be surprised if they complain they can't get through to the Cabinet officer or can't get through to anybody in the department. I will be very much surprised if there are any complaints like that."

White House Eyes the Hill

Nixon's Liaison Man Warns of End-War Mood

By David S. Broder

Washington Post Staff Writer

The top White House lobbyist has advised President Nixon that he "can expect some trouble" from Capitol Hill if there is no end-the-war agreement by spring.

William E. Timmons, the head of the President's congressional liaison office, said, "I don't think there will be any Vietnam resolutions passed in the month of January" and "I am cautiously optimistic that we can get into the spring if it takes that long."

But he warned that "at some point, I don't know when it is exactly, if there is no movement in Paris and the war continues, I think that they could try to take it away from the President."

Timmons, 42, a Tennessean who came to the White House from the staff of Sen. Bill Brock (R-Tenn.), discussed the prospects of revived congressional debate on Vietnam during an interview in his office last week. The President Nixon ordered an end to bombing above the 20th parallel.

In the course of the tape-recorded interview, he also:

- Discounted the effect of Republican disaffection from the President be-

cause of his limited personal campaigning.

- Pinpointed three freshman Southern Democrats as keys to the balance of the new senate.

- Said that, overall, the new Congress should not be much harder or easier for the President to deal with than the old one.

In discussing the possibility of a new conflict between Congress and the President over Vietnam, Timmons said that although "there will be some talk when they are all back together again . . . I don't think they will start any resolutions until after they've got their committees organized and heard the State of the Union and so forth."

He said he did not expect the bombing renewed Dec. 18 and halted yesterday or the breakdown in negotiations to become "an issue in the confirmation hearings" of Elliot L. Richardson as secretary of defense or on several appointees to second-echelon posts in the State and Defense Departments. The President hopes to see those appointments cleared by the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees and confirmed by the Senate before his Jan. 20 inauguration.

But Timmons said that "in February, we may see some movement" on anti-war resolutions. He noted that the foreign aid program is being funded under a continuing resolution that expires Feb. 28.

"That would seem to me to be a vehicle for them to tack on some Vietnam resolutions," the presidential assistant said.

"A lot depends on what happens between now and, say, Feb. 1," Timmons continued. "It depends on if we are back at the table. If we're engaged in very sensitive negotiations with Henry (Kissinger) . . . over in Paris, I think the Senate is responsible enough to go ahead and see it through for a while longer. So, I am cautiously optimistic that we will get into the spring if it takes that long . . . without any restrictions on the President through appropriations or authorizations."

tions on the President through appropriations or authorizations.

"But," he said, "if it folds up, if there is no movement of any kind, we can expect some trouble on that issue . . . The Senate has passed end-the-war things before, and the House has bailed out on them in conference, but they are not going to continue to do that forever, you know . . ."

"At some point, if there is no movement in Paris and if the war continues, I think they could try to take it away from the President," Timmons said. "But, again, I am optimistic that isn't going to happen. I just think that what the President is doing is going to work and that we are going to have an agreement . . . before they are compelled to do that."

"I think that most of the members of Congress are really pulling for the President to pull it off. They'd love to get the thing behind them . . . and they know he's working his heart out to do it . . . To even insinuate that he isn't really seeking peace is absurd. He has everything to gain by peace . . ."

"But," Timmons said, "I am also aware that if they're not meeting in Paris, if there is no on-going negotiation, and the bombing is still going on, and there is no light at the end of the tunnel, that they are going to start moving" on Capitol Hill.

The White House legislative chief said that despite the two-seat Democratic gain in the Senate and the 13-seat Republican pickup in the House, "I don't really see any big philosophical swing either way as a result of the election."

Timmons noted that "some of the net increase in the house" resulted from Republicans replacing southern Democrats "who voted about the same anyway." In the Senate, he said, conservative Republicans' victories in New Mexico, Oklahoma, Virginia and North Carolina were about offset by the defeat or retirement of Republican incumbents in Colorado, Iowa, Delaware, Maine and South Dakota.

"So I think the complexion of the

Senate will be about the same," he said "and a lot will depend on three key guys," the new Democratic senators from Kentucky, Georgia and Louisiana.

Kentucky's retiring Republican senator, John Sherman Cooper, "was with the administration on a number of issues," Timmons said, "but on a number he was quite independent of the administration and actually opposed it."

Referring to Cooper's successor, Sen.-elect Walter (Dee) Huddleston (D-Ky.), Timmons said, "I think Huddleston will probably swing from issue to issue much in the same way Cooper did, although the issues may be different."

Timmons said it will be "the same with Sam Nunn replacing Dave Gambrell" as the Georgia Senator. Both men are Democrats, but Nunn defeated Gambrell in the primary. "Gambrell was hardly an administration supporter," Timmons said, "and I think there is a hope that Sam Nunn may support the administration more than Gambrell did."

Timmons characterized the late Sen. Allen Ellender (D-La.) as "a maverick in some ways. He was generally supportive but he went off on his own some."

He said "it remains to be seen how" Ellender's successor, Sen. J. Bennett Johnston, Jr. (D) "will do down there."

"Those are the three keys," Timmons said. "If all three of them align on the anti-Administration side, then we have got some bad troubles. I could not expect that they would align with the administration consistently. I think more often they are going to be jumping, depending on the issues, be administration forces . . . so I think it Administration forces . . . so I think it is kind of a wash."

The presidential aide said he was aware there is "some resentment among Republicans about what the President did and didn't do for them in the campaign. They may feel that if the Administration isn't going to support them when they need help, why

should they support the administration, particularly on difficult issues?"

"Frankly," Timmons said, "I think that is a wrong approach for them to take, because I believe the President did quite a bit for candidates on the Hill."

He mentioned letters of endorsement, pictures in the Oval Office, television and radio clips, adding that "he sent out surrogates for them all over the place, to the point that some districts and states said, 'Oh my gosh, no more surrogates!'"

Timmons said, "I have reason to believe that . . . there was some money probably channeled into some areas . . . When a big giver gave as much as he felt he could give to the President's re-election, it was suggested that he give some to some selected candidates around."

He said he and his aides had alerted candidates to "issues we thought might be useful," like the spending ceiling,

and that "on the last weekend the President called a number of Republicans running for statewide office . . . and urged them to turn out a big vote and wished them well."

Timmons said "the big criticism we hear is that the President didn't come in and personally campaign. I am not convinced that the mere presence of the President in a city or a town necessarily elects the candidate there."

"So I think that if members are upset, they really have little cause to be. In fact, the Senators that lost—the Senate candidates—I think you can probably pin that on local issues more than the President's participation or lack of it."

But Timmons conceded that whatever the merits of the argument, "the Republican members may be a little more independent because they feel that the President and the administration didn't take care of them. And that could be harmful."

Also, he noted, they know "the President will not be running again . . . and they may be a little more independent for that reason."

"On the other hand," he said, "working for us is . . . the fact that the Democrats don't have to worry about cutting him down, because he's not going to be a candidate again . . . And that will help us a little bit."

"Also, they have to recognize that this President has some support around the country—61 per cent is a pretty healthy margin. The Democrats will probably be reluctant to take him on frontally, considering his mandate."

"There are some minuses up there and some pluses," Timmons concluded.

"On balance, I don't see the 93d Congress much different in terms of party ratios, in terms of philosophy, in terms of partisan attitude. I think we will have to go up and sell each bill on its merits, just like we have tried to do in the past."

OM DCI

Tuesday, January 16, 1973

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate Armed Services Committee reported nomination of Elliot L. Richardson, to be Secretary of Defense.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S 615-S 696, S 725-S 793

Bills Introduced: 47 bills and 7 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 367-413; S.J. Res. 19-20; S. Con. Res. 2-4; and S. Res. 18-19. Pages S 624-S 625, S 685-S 688

Budget—Economic Report: Senate agreed to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 1, extending until January 29, 1973, the time for the President to submit his Budget for fiscal year 1974, and until January 31, 1973, the time for him to submit his Economic Report, thus clearing the measure for the White House. Pages S 696-S 697

Vice-Presidential Appointments: Vice President appointed Senators Baker and Domenici to the Senate Office Building Commission. Page S 623

Committee on Aging: By unanimous consent, Senator Fannin was removed from membership on the Special Committee on Aging. Page S 619

Committee Authority To Report: By unanimous consent, Committee on Armed Services was authorized, during the adjournment of the Senate until Thursday, January 18, to report the nominations of Elliot L. Richardson, to be Secretary of Defense, William P. Clements, Jr., to be Deputy Secretary of Defense, and James R. Schlesinger, to be Director of Central Intelligence; and Committee on Finance was authorized, during the same period, to report the nominations of Caspar W. Weinberger, to be Secretary of HEW, and Frank C. Carlucci, to be Under Secretary of HEW. Pages S 785-S 786

Saturday Session: Leadership announced that Senate will meet at 10:30 a.m. on Saturday, January 20, for the purpose of gathering to attend ceremonies for the Inauguration of the President and Vice President of the United States. Page S 785

Confirmations: Senate confirmed the nominations of—William E. Simon, of New Jersey, to be Deputy Secretary of the Treasury; and

Edward L. Morgan, of Arizona, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. Page S 793

Nominations: Senate received the following nominations:

Thomas F. McCormick, of Connecticut, to be Public Printer;

Frank E. Fitzsimmons, of Maryland, to be a member of the board of directors of the Communications Satellite Corporation; and

One Navy nomination in the rank of admiral, and lists of nominations in the Air Force and Coast Guard. Pages S 786-S 793

Program for Thursday: Senate met at noon and adjourned at 3:32 p.m. until noon on Thursday, January 18, when Senators Bellmon, Allen, Hatfield, Buckley, Javits, Case, Harry F. Byrd, Jr., and Robert C. Byrd, will each be recognized for periods not to exceed 15 minutes, following which there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business not to exceed 1 hour. Pages S 615, S 696, S 785, S 786

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Armed Services: Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported the nominations of Elliot L. Richardson, to be Secretary, and William P. Clements, Jr., to be Deputy Secretary, both of the Department of Defense; and James R. Schlesinger, to be Director of Central Intelligence.

Subsequently, these nominations were reported to the Senate.

DISABILITY RETIREMENT BRIEFING

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on General Legislation received a briefing on the military disability retirement system from Lt. Gen. Leo E. Benade,

D 27

Next meeting of the SENATE
12 noon, Thursday, January 18

Next meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
12 noon, Thursday, January 18

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Military Personnel Policy, Department of Defense.

Subcommittee adjourned subject to call.

COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION

Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs: Committee, in executive session, adopted rules governing committee procedure for the 93d Congress. In addition, it was announced that subcommittees will be composed of seven members, with the exception of the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs, which will have nine members. Committee also approved creation of a new Subcommittee on Consumer Credit.

Committee will meet tomorrow, in open session, on the nomination of James T. Lynn, to be Secretary of HUD, to be followed by an executive session on this nomination and other committee business.

NOMINATION

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Committee began hearings on the nomination of John C. Whitaker, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of the Interior, receiving testimony from Senators Mathias and Beall; and Rogers C. B. Morton, Secretary of the Interior. The nominee was present to testify and answer questions on his own behalf.

Hearings continue on Thursday, January 18.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held at noon on Thursday, January 18.

Committee Meetings

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittees on Defense and Military Construction held a joint executive meeting with CIA Director Helms on special intelligence matters.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 17

(All meetings are open unless otherwise designated)

Senate

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, executive, organizational meeting, 10 a.m., 324 Russell Office Building.

Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, to hold hearings on the nomination of James T. Lynn, to be Secretary of HUD, to be followed by an executive session on this nomination and other committee business, 10 a.m., 5302 Dirksen Office Building.

Committee on the Judiciary, to hold hearings on the nominations of Joseph T. Sneed, to be Deputy Attorney General, and Robert H. Bork, to be Solicitor General of the United States,

both of the Department of Justice, 10:30 a.m., 2228 Dirksen Office Building.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to hold hearings in connection with the nomination of Caspar W. Weinberger, to be Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, 9:30 a.m., 4232 Dirksen Office Building.

Committee on Rules and Administration, executive, on committee business, 10 a.m., 301 Russell Office Building.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Defense, executive, 10 a.m., H-140 Capitol.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Europe, to continue hearings on European reactions to recent developments in Vietnam, 10 a.m., 2200 Rayburn Building.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

SENATE

Church, Frank, Idaho, E225
Helms, Jesse A., N.C., E221
Weicker, Lowell P., Jr., Conn., E222

HOUSE

Ashbrook, John M., Ohio, E227
Brademas, John, Ind., E223, E231
Carter, Tim Lee, Ky., E226, E232

Crane, Philip M., Ill., E229
Fasceli, Dante B., Fla., E226
Rosenthal, Benjamin S., N.Y., E221
Scherle, William J., Iowa, E231
Thompson, Frank, Jr., N.J., E232

January 16, 1973

some questions about some domestic matters in just a moment. Right now back to Frank in New York.

MCGEE. And we will return to Washington shortly. We'll be back after this message.

MCGEE. Democratic Senator Robert Byrd of West Virginia, the Majority Whip in the Senate, is in our Washington studio with Today Washington editor Bill Monroe and our congressional correspondent Paul Duke.

And, Senator, before we turn to domestic affairs, as Bill said we would, I would like to ask one more question about Vietnam. What chance do you give the current phase of Kissinger-Le Duc Tho talks, which started in Paris today—do you think there's a chance for them?

Senator Byrd. I do. I think...

MCGEE. Could you tell—please go ahead.

Senator Byrd. I think there is a chance. I feel that if our own negotiators will demonstrate persistence and patience—I know that the meetings have been frustrating—and if the Soviet Union and the Red Chinese would apply some pressure on the North Vietnamese, I think we can get an agreement. We were led to believe that we were close to one, and I think that we can get one.

MONROE. Paul?

DUKE. Senator Byrd, as you know, there is considerable sentiment in Congress now for challenging the President on a variety of matters, not just on the war, but on the fact that he is not spending all the money appropriated by Congress, on the fact that he doesn't let White House people come up and testify on the Hill. Do you think that Congress will do anything? Do you think that Congress will now try to regain some of the power which it has given up to the Executive Branch?

Senator Byrd. I think it will. But whether it can mount a sustained effort is the real question.

DUKE. Well, now, as one example, the President recommended in 1970 a rather extensive reorganization program for Cabinet agencies. Congress sat on this and did nothing. Now Mr. Nixon has moved to implement this on his own by naming three members of the Cabinet to be super Cabinet officers. Does this offend you, that he has done this without getting Congress's approval?

Senator Byrd. I appreciate the President's desire to relieve the government of its muscle-bound condition, to use his phrase. I also share his desire to streamline the government and to get some better control over the sprawling bureaucracy. However I think that he's going about it in the wrong way. I think this is a terrible mistake, this appointing of three super Secretaries to form a—a super Cabinet. I think that it will create division and friction and ill will among the various departments. It is a downgrading of the departments of Commerce, Labor, Transportation, and Interior. I think that it will result in a fragmentation of responsibility, an overlapping of jurisdiction, a diffusal of authority that can only contribute to governmental schizophrenia and departmental chaos and confusion.

DUKE. Isn't it also a downgrading of Congress? Because he is doing it—in effect, he is thumbing his nose at Congress and saying, "I'm going to do this regardless of what Congress thinks."

Senator Byrd. I don't think there's any question about it. The Congress will have difficulty in finding out where the power lies. One Secretary will make a statement, and another Secretary will refute that statement.

DUKE. Well, what's Congress going to do about it?

Senator Byrd. I hope that Congress will go into it very thoroughly when it considers the nominations of Mr. Weinberger and Mr. Lynn. And I hope that it will possibly con-

sider refusing the nominations if it is not satisfied with their testimony. There's a possibility down the road that it might cut off funds for some of the activities in those various departments. But I think the President's opening up a can of worms.

MONROE. Senator, would you foresee any possibility that somebody like the President's nominee for Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Mr. James Lynn—that the Senate might hold up that appointment unless the administration gives assurance that certain housing monies that the Senate wants spent will be spent?

Senator Byrd. I think there's a possibility and I think it ought to. I think Congress has to utilize the instruments by which it can make its power felt.

MONROE. What do you think's going to happen in the argument between the Congress and the White House over spending of funds that the Congress has authorized spent and that the President doesn't want to spend, such as in the water cleanup bill? Mr. Ehrlichman, the President's assistant, said yesterday that some of these laws have mandatory language in them and indicate that the funds must be spent, but other laws such language is not present and that in those cases the White House feels that the President can spend or not spend as he wishes.

Senator Byrd. Some of the impoundments are legal; some of them are mandated. But in most of these instances that we're talking about, they're not. And here's where the danger lies. I think that Congress ought to write into some of the bills a mandatory provision that the monies be spent for the purposes intended.

MONROE. How about the withholding of the water cleanup funds, where the President is spending about \$5 billion out of 11 billion that the Congress wanted spent—is that a proper impoundment in your opinion?

Senator Byrd. I don't think so. Now, the funds haven't actually been appropriated. What he's doing, really, is impounding obligatory authority, which is the same thing.

DUKE. Senator Byrd, one of the reasons the administration is trying to hold down federal spending, of course, is to avoid a tax increase. Do you think it will succeed in this objective? Or do you foresee still the possibility of a tax increase in 1973?

Senator Byrd. I think there's the possibility of a tax increase. But I do feel that both the Congress and the Executive are going to exercise some degree of responsibility in holding down spending, so that perhaps a tax increase can be put off.

MONROE. Along the lines Paul is talking about, isn't there a valid argument that comes from White House people that the Congress has been irresponsible about spending and that one reason the President's got to hold these funds back is that the Congress doesn't count up how much it's spending in relation to keeping the budget down?

Senator Byrd. There is some validity to that. There are many times when Senators offer amendments to appropriation bills on the Senate floor on which there have been no hearings, and of course these increase the overall funds. There has been this irresponsibility, if we might term it that.

DUKE. We're hearing new talk, too, about some kind of tax reform bill that would remove some of the inequities from the tax system. Is this a possibility this year?

Senator Byrd. It's a possibility. Mr. Mills has indicated that a tax reform bill might come along. I would rather think that it would be late in the year, if at all this year, and possibly next year.

DUKE. What about welfare reform? Is that a possibility?

Senator Byrd. There is no question but there is need for welfare reform. But I don't foresee it coming along.

MONROE. Do you see any sweeping reforms

of congressional procedures coming out of this session, Senator? There's been a lot of talk about reforms in relation to seniority, about reforms in relation to information gathering, bringing in computer, and raising staffs and that sort of thing.

Senator Byrd. I don't see any fundamental changes coming along, no.

MONROE. Do you think they're needed?

Senator Byrd. I think that senators need to reform themselves. I don't think the fault is in our stars so much as it is in ourselves. I think that if senators would stay on the job, and stop running around the country and making speeches, and apply themselves to the work, and not be absent, I think that we could get a lot more done. A few computers perhaps, yes. But why have a \$100,000 computer standing around for use three days out of 365? The Congress has the General Accounting Office, the Comptroller General's Office, with 5,000 employees; this is an arm of the Congress. Why doesn't the Congress utilize these 5,000 men more?

MONROE. Aren't you talking about a reform of human nature, Senator?

Senator Byrd. No, I'm just talking about a reform of our own working habits.

DUKE. And when you suggest that senators shouldn't be running around the country, are you suggesting there should be no more senators running for President?

Senator Byrd. Well, I'm not suggesting there be no more, but perhaps there could be a fewer number.

MONROE. Senator, thank you very much for being with us this morning. Senator Robert Byrd of West Virginia, the Democratic Whip.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATORS HATFIELD, BUCKLEY, JAVITS, CASE, AND HARRY F. BYRD, JR., ON THURSDAY, JANUARY 18, 1973

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, on Thursday, immediately following the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN) and prior to the recognition of the junior Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD), the following Senators be recognized, each for not to exceed 15 minutes, and in the order stated: Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. BUCKLEY, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. CASE, and Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, JANUARY 18, 1973, TO 10:30 A.M. SATURDAY, JANUARY 20, 1973

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business on Thursday next it stand in adjournment until 10:30 a.m. on Saturday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO REPORT NOMINATIONS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may be authorized to report the nominations of Messrs. Richardson, Clements, and Schlesinger during the adjournment of the Senate over until Thursday next.

January 16, 1973

11786

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest what I hope will be the final quorum call of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON FINANCE TO REPORT NOMINATIONS

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance may report the nominations of Mr. Weinberger to be Secretary of HEW and Mr. Carlucci to be Under Secretary of HEW, notwithstanding the adjournment of the Senate over until Thursday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRIFFIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM FOR THURSDAY

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the program for Thursday next is as follows:

The Senate will convene at 12 o'clock meridian. After the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, the following Senators will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes each and in the order stated: Mr. BELLMON, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. BUCKLEY, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. CASE, Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., and Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD.

At the conclusion of the special orders for the recognition of Senators, there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 1 hour, with statements limited therein to 5 minutes.

No rollcall votes are anticipated on Thursday.

When the Senate concludes its business on Thursday, it will stand in adjournment until 10:30 a.m. on Saturday next, at which time Senators will proceed in a body to the ceremony inaugurating the President and Vice President of the United States.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY, JANUARY 18, 1973

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock meridian on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and at 3:32 p.m. the Senate adjourned until Thursday, January 18, 1973, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 16, 1973:

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Thomas F. McCormick, of Connecticut, to be Public Printer, vice Adolphus Nichols Spence II, deceased.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named officers of the Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of captain:

William D. Harvey	Howard H. Istock
Robert Russell	Robert J. Hanson
Claude W. Jenkins	Edwin H. Daniels
Edmund Janczyk	Keith B. Schumacher
Peter J. Delaat, Jr.	Ralph C. Hill
Robert C. Branham	Charles E. Mathieu
Raymond H. Baetsen, Jr.	Glenn F. Young
Robert S. Lucas	James E. Grabb
John F. Lobkovich	Edward C. Farmer, Jr.
David J. Linde	Albert G. Stirling
Robert B. Sims	Ernest E. Rowland, Jr.
Gilbert P. Sherburne	David G. Howland
Richard B. Brooks	William D. Markle, Jr.
James R. Kelly	Donald C. Hintze
William S. Black	Bernard A. Hoyland
Robert T. Platt, Jr.	William E. Lehr, Jr.
John H. Byrd, Jr.	Joseph M. Kelly
Kenneth G. Wiman	Hal F. Olson
John D. Steinbacher	Roger L. Madson
David F. McIntosh, Jr.	Walter W. Kohl, Jr.
Robert V. Hackney	James C. Irwin
Robert G. Moore	William P. Kozlovsky
Melvin W. Hallock	Edwin L. Parker
Edward J. Ard	Milton Y. Suzlich
Herbert G. Lyons	Clyde T. Lusk, Jr.
Patrick M. Jacobsen	Bobby F. Hollingsworth

The following-named officers of the Coast Guard Reserve for promotion to the grades indicated:

Captain

William P. Allen
Sandiford S. Bee, Jr.

Commander

Richard W. Doherty
Theodore L. Seaman
Lawrence C. Foley
Charles L. Hayes, Jr.

The following-named officers of the Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander:

Richard E. MacDonald	Herbert J. Nuse
Donald F. Potter	Jack E. Arrington
Earl J. Meiers, Jr.	John H. Frele
Grant W. Risinger	Daniel A. Sutyak
Robert R. Dudley	Doyle S. Porter
James T. Fenner	John H. Ingram
David F. Orszak	William B. Clark
Rene N. Roussel	Forrest W. Pell
James R. Norman	Paul B. Robertson
David W. Kennedy, Jr.	Frank A. Christoph
Roland W. Bresault, Jr.	Louis R. Stowe
Robert R. Harber, Jr.	Frank M. Alonzo
Valentine Gaida	Charles H. Studstill
Richard E. Simpson	Richard L. Luna
Charles M. Burleson	Melvin F. Gouthro
Cordus C. Bough	Gilbert Aguilar
Lennox A. Johnson	James A. Shepard
Louis Debernardi, Jr.	Johnnie L. Hair
Owen M. Halstad	Ammon C. McDole
John E. Cutright	Allen R. Gulau

Lenwood M. Quidley
John McCracken
William Aliff
Melvin Long
Joseph E. Tamalonis
William Race
Francis N. Harrell
Brent Malcolm
Stanley E. Bork
Willis E. Lawrence III
Robert C. White
James V. O'Neill
Robert F. Doughty
Paul G. Smith
Frank M. Chlischczyk, Jr.
Alvin K. Sumner
William N. Rohrer
John M. Lewis
Marvin E. Wilmoth
John F. Overath
Robert H. Stracener
George E. Ellis
Daniel R. Irving
Preston E. McMillan
Herbert L. Johnson
Thomas L. Young
William S. Ricks
William S. Vinson
Douglas R. Herlihy
Richard E. Bruce
Laurence J. Murphy, Jr.
James F. Van Vranken
Edward Stadnicar
Walter C. Parker
Donald C. Hibbard
William T. Foran
Ted G. Walters
Cassius L. Lisk
Theodore M. Nutting
James H. Ferguson
Jean Snyder
Edward A. Harnes III
Ross Bell
Francis W. Miller
Alton E. Turner
John P. Shioli
Leon K. Thomas
Clarence C. Martin, Jr.
Michael J. Dewitt
Dennis L. Morrissey
Charles S. Park, III
Roland H. Buster
Robert C. Hiler
Franklin L. Fountaine
Stanley W. Mead
Forrest W. Ringsage
Earl R. Schattenberg
Robert L. Perkins
Billy G. Bailey
Carlton P. Smith
Theodore J. Polgar
John K. Jenkins
Taft C. Pilcher
James W. Amos
Wayne W. Becker
William M. Simpson, Jr.

John D. Spade
Thomas E. Yentsch
Robert T. Luckritz
John A. Pierson
David K. Durry
Cecil W. Allison
Robert W. Mason
Kipling E. Grassitt
Arcangelo V. Arcetti
William H. Blanchard
Michael E. Koloski
Edward A. Chazal, Jr.
William H. Norris
Frederick M. Hamilton
Samuel J. Dennis
Thomas R. Pennington
James A. White
Douglas H. Teeson
Robert M. Stephan, Jr.

Carl Josephson
Stephen L. Brundage
Kent H. Williams
Laurence H. Somers
Peter T. Poulos
Jerry M. Payne
John W. Carbin
Glenn E. Serotsky
Richard D. Manning
Paul M. Blayne
Donald S. Jensen
Carl H. Helman III
Joseph R. Offutt, Jr.
Howard Newhoff
James A. Sanial, Jr.
Ralph E. Anderson
Robert J. Gray
Randall D. Peterson
Paul N. Samek
Walter S. Viglienza
Gerald J. Zanolli
Richard W. Walton
Thomas E. Omri
James D. Morgan
John E. Schwartz
Richard B. Chapman
Delgene O. Phillips
Joseph P. Coleman
Andrew T. Horsey
Gene E. Bowen
Joseph M. Rogers
Francis J. Wright, Jr.
Carl H. Pearce
Richard E. Ruhe, Jr.
Robert W. Christiansen
Robert L. Storch, Jr.
Larry R. Greif
Robert W. Scobie
Stephen H. Cox
James O. Alexander
Darwin D. Buettner
Donald J. Green
Robert E. Harrington, Jr.
Richard E. Casey
Richard A. Bundy
Harold V. Smith
Thomas H. Robinson
Peter L. Ehrman
Keith E. Nichols

The following named officer to be a permanent commissioned officer in the Coast Guard in the grade of lieutenant commander having been found fit for duty while on the temporary disability retired list:

Earl D. Johnson

The following named Coast Guard Reserve officers to be permanent commissioned officers in the Regular Coast Guard to the grade of lieutenant:

Edward H. Bonekempfer III	Craig F. Eisenbels
Francis X. Owens	Richard G. Seagrave
William E. Wade, Jr.	John A. Doty
William M. Jacobs	Gerald W. Abrams
	Edward A. Altomos

The following named graduates of the Coast Guard Academy to be permanent commissioned officers in the Coast Guard to the grade of ensign:

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S 297-S 413

Bills Introduced: 33 bills and 2 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 252-284; S.J. Res. 13; and S. Res. 13.

Pages S 304-S 305, S 356-S 357

Resolution Agreed To:

Secret Government documents: Senate agreed to S. Res. 13, to establish a special ad hoc committee to study questions related to secret and confidential Government documents.

Pages S 304-S 305

Presidential Messages: Senate received three messages from the President, as follows:

(1) Transmitting the 16th Annual Report of the President on the Trade Agreements Program—referred to Committee on Finance;

(2) Transmitting the Annual Report of the Office of Alien Property for Fiscal Year 1971—referred to Committee on the Judiciary; and

(3) Transmitting report on the comparability adjustment ordered for the Federal statutory pay systems in January 1973—referred to Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Pages S 297-S 298

Treaty Received: Senate received treaty between the United States and Colombia concerning the status of three uninhabited coral reefs in the Caribbean (Ex. A, 93d Cong., 1st sess.), the injunction of secrecy was removed therefrom, and the treaty, together with accompanying papers, was referred to Committee on Foreign Relations.

Page S 300

Committee Membership Agreements: Senate agreed to a unanimous-consent request of Senator Mansfield relative to eligibility of Senators to serve on Joint Committees, and to the number of Senate committees on which a Senator may serve.

Senate also agreed to a unanimous-consent request of Senator Mansfield the effect of which gives seniority on Committee on Government Operations to Senator Nunn over Senator Huddleston, instead of the reverse order as agreed to (in S. Res. 12) on January 4, 1973.

Page S 301

Program for Thursday: Senate met at noon and adjourned at 2:02 p.m. until noon on Thursday, January 11, when Senators Moss, Abourezk, and Harry F.

Byrd, Jr., will each be recognized for a period not to exceed 15 minutes, following which there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business not to exceed 30 minutes.

Pages S 297, S 298, S 344-S 345, S 346, S 413

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NOMINATION AND BRIEFING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee began hearings on the nomination of Elliot L. Richardson, to be Secretary of Defense, receiving testimony from Senator Brooke. The nominee was present to testify and answer questions on his own behalf.

Hearings continue tomorrow on this nomination and on the nominations of William P. Clements, Jr., to be Deputy Secretary of Defense, and James R. Schlesinger, to be Director of Central Intelligence.

On Monday, January 8, committee in executive session, received a briefing to review world developments from Richard Helms, Director of Central Intelligence.

NOMINATION

Committee on Commerce: Committee began hearings on the nomination of Claude S. Brinegar, to be Secretary of Transportation, receiving testimony from Senators Cranston and Tunney; and John Kramer on behalf of Theodore Kheel, attorney, New York City. The nominee was present to testify and answer questions on his own behalf.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

AIRCRAFT SEIZURE

Committee on Commerce: Committee began hearings on S. 39, providing a more effective program to prevent aircraft seizure, and on the administration's emergency antihijacking regulations, having as its witnesses G. M. Gross, Southern Airways, Inc., Atlanta; George J. Bean; Donald G. Shay; and J. Donald Riley, all of the Airport Operators Council International; Earle A. Taylor, Director of Aviation, Clark County, Las Vegas; Russell Hoyt, American Association of Airport Executives, Washington, D.C.; and William Shay, Commissioner of Aviation, Broom County, Binghamton, N.Y.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

hold Ortona in high regard for his contributions in that field.

He plays the piano though he says that it's debatable just how well. When he arrived in Washington five years ago as Italy's ambassador, the press described him as "a musician." Soon he was called "a pianist." Finally, he learned through the press that "I am a concert pianist."

In his delightfully inverted English, he sums up his talents this way:

"I just know to play badly the piano."

But former Supreme Court Justice Abe Fortas, who often fiddles to Ortona's piano accompaniment at Sunday night get-togethers in the Fortas home or at the Italian embassy, disputes such modesty.

"He's a true lover of music, an absolutely irresistible man—musicians both here and in New York owe him a great deal. In fact," says Fortas, "music in this country owes an enormous debt to Ortona."

Fortas says that Ortona, "more than any other ambassador in Washington, has consistently held musical evenings at the embassy. Sometime he plays, and he plays well. Sometimes he invites American or Italian musicians to play. He has encouraged young musicians in New York as well as in Washington."

He also has seen to it that his country showed its appreciation to musicians by conferring decorations upon such distinguished ones as pianist Artur Schnabel and Eugene Ormandy, conductor of the Philadelphia Orchestra.

Ortona's next public musical appearance will be Jan. 31 when he and his favorite companion at a double keyboard, former Assistant Secretary of Defense Robert LeBaron, sit down at the embassy's baby grand pianos to entertain for Peggy LeBaron's International Neighbors Club.

His love of music has sometime been a challenge to hosts who don't happen to have a piano.

Former U.S. Ambassador to Luxembourg and the U.S. Chief of Protocol during the Eisenhower administration, Wiley T. Buchanan Jr., whom Ortona visits every summer at Newport, found the ambassador disappearing every day.

"We had no piano," says Buchanan, "so he went around to homes of our friends who did. There he would be lost at the keyboard for two hours at a time."

The Buchanans ordered a piano so that the Italian diplomat could find all the musical comforts he missed right inside their front door.

The Buchanans' grandchildren, somewhat confused by the ambassador's informal attire, once mistook him for a new chauffeur.

Ortona, playing along, escorted the children to his Fiat, drove them all around Newport and made every stop demanded. "He thought this a huge joke," says Buchanan.)

As the father of two grown daughters and a son and the grandfather of three, Ortona dotes on children.

"When my first grandchild was born, I started the best career of my life," he says.

When his diplomatic career ends in three years (Italy's foreign service has mandatory retirement at age 65), Ambassador Ortona will have the satisfaction of knowing that he was the guiding light behind the proposed new Italian embassy-chancery complex, to be built on a five-acre, \$1 million tract at the corner of Massachusetts Avenue and Whitehaven Street, NW.

American architects will supply the technical expertise but Italian architects will draw up plans that will include incorporation of all works of fine art now in the present embassy at 16th and Fuller Streets, NW.

Ortona is completing negotiations now and will go to Rome next week to confer with architects.

Egidio Ortona was born on Sept. 16, 1910, in the small Piedmont hill country town of Casale Monferrato in northern Italy.

His father was a cavalry officer in the Italian army and close friend of Caprilli, inventor of "the forward seat," a modern method of riding horseback. Predictably, young Egidio took to the saddle very young.

His musical education began at age 8 and despite the seemingly interminable drilling to learn his scales, he developed a crush on his music teacher.

At age 16, when he was a student at the local lyceum, he met tall, voluble Giulia Rossi. He was two years ahead of her in school and so far ahead of her in music that she finally gave up playing herself.

"He was just too good for me," says Giulia Rossi Ortona. "It's uncanny how he can read any piece of music at sight."

Music, tennis and dancing, which both enjoyed, created a strong community of interest and in 1935 they were married.

But before that, during the nine-year interval between their first meeting and their marriage, Egidio Ortona packed considerable education into his young life.

He spent a year at the University of Politicians, another year at the London School of Economics and finally got his law degree at the University of Torino (Turin) in 1931. He never practiced law but, instead, entered the Italian foreign service. He was just 21.

At the bottom of the diplomatic career ladder, he started his climb by serving in posts at Cairo, Johannesburg, London and finally Washington.

The handsome Italian Embassy, built years before to resemble an elegant palazzo, was closed during war years. So he worked at the Shoreham Hotel.

"The American government had decided to have an Italian mission come to Washington to discuss postwar economics and rebuilding after the war's destruction," he says. "I and four other members of the mission were engaged in problems of economic assistance for Italy."

The longer Ortona stayed in Washington, the more reasons he found to remain. The work was fascinating and challenging—"It was a most interesting thing to try to enhance relations between the United States and Italy. The results of the Marshall Plan in Italy between 1948 and 1952 were so good."

Ortona became a secretary, then counselor, then minister counselor and finally minister of the reopened Italian embassy. His economic skills were so valued by his government that he often represented Italy at such conferences as the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

In 1958, he was assigned to the United Nations in New York as Italy's ambassador. He stayed in that post until 1961 when he was called home for a prime spot in the foreign ministry as director general of economic affairs.

He held that post until 1966 when he was made secretary general of the Foreign Ministry, the top career spot equal to U.S. Under Secretary of State.

In 1967 he was assigned to Washington, again, this time as ambassador plenipotentiary and extraordinary.

While he has logged up an impressive reputation as a skilled and serious diplomat, he and his wife have made an equally dramatic impact on the social front in Washington. In fact, their social calendar is so packed that Mrs. Ortona said rather helplessly the other day that "there is simply no time to sleep."

Ambassador Ortona does not think in terms of missed sleep. In addition to his diplomatic duties and his music, horseback riding and vigorous daily swim at the University Club he has plans for still another activity.

"If circumstances permit," he says, "I may try flying. I am always trying to do everything I can."

"Oh, no!" says his wife who had not heard of his interest in flying. "I hate flying. It makes me sick."

Chances are that Giulia Ortona, who has never been able to talk her husband out of anything he wants to do, will go right along with this latest idea, just as she has done for nearly four decades.

January 23, 1973

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 1137

nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—
DEATH OF FORMER PRESIDENT
LYNDON B. JOHNSON

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Lyndon Baines Johnson, former President of the United States of America, and transmitted the resolution of the House of Representatives (H. Res. 152) relating thereto.

The message announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 90) authorizing the remains of former President Lyndon B. Johnson to lie in state in the rotunda of the Capitol, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 163) designating the week commencing January 28, 1973, as "International Clergy Week in the United States", and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of title 20, United States Code, sections 42 and 43, the Speaker had appointed Mr. MAHON, Mr. ROONEY of New York, and Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, on the part of the House.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House on House Concurrent Resolution 90.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT) laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 90, which was read as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 90

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in recognition of the long and distinguished service rendered to the Nation and to the world by Lyndon B. Johnson, Thirty-sixth President of the United States, his remains be permitted to lie in state in the rotunda of the Capitol from January 24 to January 25, 1973, and the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate, shall take all necessary steps for the accomplishment of that purpose.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 90) was considered and unanimously agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION DEPARTMENT
OF DEFENSE AND CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT). Pursuant to the previous order, the Senate will now go into executive session to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider en bloc the nominations of Mr. William P. Clements, Jr. of Texas and Mr. James R. Schlesinger of Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the two nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Mr. William P. Clements, Jr., of Texas, to be a Deputy Secretary of Defense, in the Department of Defense; and the nomination of Mr. James R. Schlesinger, of Virginia, to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time for debate is limited to 2 hours, with 1 hour to each side.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I address the Chair for recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, what is the pending order of business now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is on the nomination of Mr. William P. Clements, Jr., of Texas, and Mr. James R. Schlesinger, of Virginia, whose nominations will be considered en bloc.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, my remarks to the Senate on this matter will be brief.

I should like to inquire of the majority whip whether the Senator from Iowa has been notified.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. The distinguished Senator from Iowa is on his way to the Chamber.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, would the distinguished Senator from Mississippi like me to ask for the yeas and nays now on the two nominations?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to order the yeas and nays on the two nominations with one show of seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? There being no objection, and there being a sufficient show of seconds, the yeas and nays on the two nominations are ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the pending matter before the Senate Executive Session is the question of whether the Senate will advise and consent to the nomination of Mr. William P. Clements, Jr., of Texas, to the office of Deputy Secretary of Defense. That nomination was referred to the Armed Services Committee along with the nomination of the Honorable Elliot L. Richardson, of Mas-

sachusetts, now Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who was nominated by the President this January to be Secretary of Defense.

The committee considered each of these nominations and has taken quite seriously—as the committee should—its duty and obligation to go into all relevant matters in connection with these men, their backgrounds, their abilities, their capabilities and their attitudes towards the duties that they will assume, if approved, as well as their philosophies as to our system of government.

I want to say this about the nomination of Mr. Richardson; it could well have been considered first. I had hoped, of course, that that could be done. But there were some delays, without anyone's being at fault. It was first agreed that that nomination would be carried over until Thursday of this week. The plans for this have already had to be changed because of the passing of Lyndon Baines Johnson, the former President of the United States.

So Mr. Richardson's nomination will be carried over until Friday of this week and, in accordance with the unanimous consent agreement, will be debated some on Friday and the vote will be taken. I hope, on next Monday. But I do not believe there has been agreement yet to vote next Monday. I will propose to the leadership that they request the vote before we adjourn today.

Also today I may have some remarks, after these are disposed of, about the nomination of Mr. Richardson.

I believe we are under controlled time; is that correct, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield myself 20 minutes or so much thereof as I may use.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi may proceed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Committee on Armed Services has reported the nomination of Mr. William P. Clements, Jr., of Texas. After public hearings and full discussion, 13 of the 15 committee members recorded themselves in favor of the nomination. There were no dissenting votes. No member voted against the nomination. One member favored delaying certain presidential appointments at that time and voted, "present," but said he found no fault with Mr. Clements.

Mr. Clements is a respected Texas businessman with a fine and extensive background in the various aspects of his field. He has a distinguished record in business and in civic enterprise in Dallas. He was praised in the committee hearings by both Senators from Texas, one a member of the majority and the other a member of the minority.

I think there is good and recent precedent for approving a businessman as Deputy Secretary of Defense. I believe that Mr. David Packard performed very well indeed in that job. I believe that Mr. Clements can use his own business expertise and experience to improve and reform Pentagon procedures in areas such as procurement.

Mr. President, I just said that Mr. Packard did an outstanding job and then

S1138

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

January 23, 1973

I talked about still improving and reforming procedures of procurement. There is much work still to be done in that field. Mr. Packard stayed in the Pentagon only 3 years but they were 3 fruitful years and he made a start in this very difficult field of procurement. It is a difficult field for the services and for the secretaries and for the industrial people as well.

I found Mr. Clements to be a man of tremendous energy and his great capabilities are already well proven. Senators will recall that under legislation approved last year, a second Deputy Secretary of Defense will be appointed to the Defense Department. That appointment will be made later, after Mr. Clements and the new Secretary of Defense, Mr. Richardson, have settled on their own working relationships.

It should be noted, however, that Mr. Clements is to be designated as the principal deputy, to serve as top man, if necessary, in the absence of the Secretary.

Mr. President, I emphasize that this is not just another office. This deputy secretary holds a highly important office. It carries tremendous power and responsibility. He will be No. 2 only to the Secretary of Defense. He will be acting Secretary of Defense in the absence of the Secretary and at meetings to which the Secretary cannot go. He will have special duties in the field of military procurement and in other operations of the Department of Defense which total in the neighborhood of \$77 billion to \$80 billion per year.

Mr. Clements impressed me greatly. I talked with him some 2 hours in private conference, and he was rather extensively examined, too, by all members of the committee. I was surprised and favorably impressed with his very fine knowledge of the problems of military procurement, even before he starts in this office, as well as his knowledge of other requirements of the office. That is explained when we recall that he was a member of the so-called Fitzhugh Commission, the blue ribbon panel that was appointed by President Nixon, near the beginning of his first term, to look into procurement and other matters in the Department of Defense. Mr. Clements was one of the active members of that panel, and he shows a very fine knowledge of the subject matter which he gained there and has followed up to some degree.

I note that Mr. Clements has been described in the press as an "oil man." However, he told the committee that his successful business has been oil drilling and that he is not in the oil business as such. I do not want to leave the impression that it is a sin to be in the oil business. There are very honorable men in that business. But this was viewed by the press as something that would derogate from Mr. Clements. I point out now that he is not in that business but is in the oil drilling business.

Mr. President, I had asked that copies of our printed hearing record be made available to Senators, and I ask that inquiry be made at this time to see whether the hearings are available to Senators.

On page 173 of the hearing record appears a letter in which Mr. Clements summarizes the action he has taken to avoid any possible conflict of interest. That means conflict of interest as Acting Secretary of Defense and Deputy Secretary of Defense with reference to dealings, purchases, and contracts that take place in the Defense Department. His letter makes him conform to the precedents of the Committee on Armed Services in this regard, and we unanimously cleared his record on that score.

He has also provided a file on a lawsuit in which his company is involved and which has given rise to some press reports. That matter appears at pages 139 to 157 of the printed hearing record. That tells the entire story about this lawsuit.

It is a rather long printed record; but, briefly summed up, Mr. Clements' firm had a contract to perform some services almost 10 years ago with the Argentine Government in South America. They satisfactorily performed it, in his view, but in 1966, almost 7 years ago, three lawsuits were filed. Two of the lawsuits involve individuals who allege failure to return their full part of a 20-percent finder's fee. Mr. Clements is not involved personally in that.

He is a party in the third suit on a technical basis, one might say, because the defendant in that case is the Argentine subsidiary of his company and had to be left as an active organization, so that anyone who wanted to sue could do so. That is customary in business, when you are leaving a country.

No member of the committee, so far as I have heard, found anything—nor did the staff of the committee find anything—that was really derogatory to Mr. Clements. The litigation involves something about the amount of charges to overhead under the disposition of the contract. He pointed out that the Internal Revenue Service in Washington—our Internal Revenue Service—required him to charge more to overhead, and that was a standard business proposition as seen by the Internal Revenue Service.

The Securities and Exchange Commission has stated that the scope of the litigation was not such that the matter should have been reported to the company's shareholders. Full information on this matter is included in the record. This record has been out for several days now, and I refer anyone who might be interested to that record.

Mr. President, we on the committee are well aware of the problems that will beset the Defense Department, and we know that the problems will fall in part on Mr. Clements' shoulders. I am expecting some very fine work from this gentleman. I believe he has the capacity. We know he has the willingness, and he has a world of energy to use. If he can get started and if he is given the authority, he is the kind of man who will be able to accomplish something in this problem area. Some of the problems with which he will be confronted lend themselves to solution through better management and through better procurement, and I believe that Mr. Clements will be able to make headway against these problems.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous con-

sent to have printed in the RECORD certain parts of a brief report that was filed by the committee through its member, the Senator from Texas (Mr. Tower), relating to the committee action, the qualifications, and the conclusions of the committee. Also, in my statement here and in this report we point out that Mr. Clements, in our examination of him in open session, clearly stated that he would appear before any committee and testify.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE ACTION

Mr. Clements' nomination was forwarded to the Senate on January 4, 1973, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services on January 8, 1973. The committee conducted hearings on January 11, 1973, in public session, during which the committee carefully scrutinized the nominee's credentials and qualifications. After full consideration, the committee found the nominee eminently qualified for the position of Deputy Secretary of Defense. In executive session on January 16, 1973, the committee voted to report favorably on the nomination of Mr. Clements. Thirteen members voted in the affirmative, one member voted present, and there were no negative votes.

QUALIFICATIONS

During the course of the hearings, the committee thoroughly examined the nominee's qualifications and experience. The committee believes that Mr. Clements is a man of highest integrity, ability, and character.

In July 1969, the nominee was named by the President and the Secretary of Defense to serve on the Blue Ribbon Defense Panel which was to undertake a study of the Department of Defense. The broad charter permitted the panel to make a thorough examination of the organization and management of the Defense Department including the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the defense agencies, and the military services as it affects the Department's mission performance, decision-making process, command, and control, and other matters with emphasis on the responsiveness to the requirements of the President and the Secretary of Defense. The Panel was also charged with examining defense procurement policies and practices and research and development efforts with emphasis on cost, time, and quality. On July 1, 1970, the Panel made its report to the President together with recommendations. During the hearings the committee determined that the nominee has a thorough grasp of the many problems associated with the management of the Defense Establishment. He demonstrated a keen awareness of the weapons acquisition process and the need for reform in the field of procurement practices and procedures. The nominee's biographical summary is contained on pages 133 and 134 of the record of hearings.

WILLINGNESS TO TESTIFY

On January 15, 1973, the nominee was questioned at a special hearing of the committee with respect to his willingness to appear and testify before committees of the Senate. Mr. Clements has pledged to be responsive and to cooperate when requested to appear as a witness before committees of the Senate. This is in compliance with the resolution of the Senate Democratic conference which requested nominees to make, as a prerequisite to confirmation, a commitment to appear before Senate committees when requested. The testimony of the nominee is set forth in the record of hearings wherein he expressed his willingness to comply.

FINANCIAL HOLDINGS

The committee has determined that if the nominee is confirmed as Deputy Secretary

January 23, 1973

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

S 1139

of Defense his financial holdings will not conflict in any way with his performance of duties in that office.

Mr. Clements is a stockholder and chairman of the board of SEDCO, Inc., of Dallas, Tex., a private corporation. This corporation currently has an extremely small amount of engineering work being performed for the Department of Defense. This work will be concluded within a short time. Moreover, the SEDCO corporation has furnished to the committee a copy of the corporate resolution indicating that if Mr. Clements' nomination is confirmed, it will no longer undertake or accept contracts in any form from the Department of Defense.

There is one stock now owned by Mr. Clements, that of Keebler, on the statistical list, which he has stated that if confirmed, will be sold within 90 days. There is printed on pages 139 and 140 of the hearings a letter from Mr. Clements setting forth the details on this entire matter.

CONCLUSION

It is the opinion of the committee that Mr. Clements is well qualified for the post to which he has been nominated. The nomination is favorably reported and the committee recommends that the nomination be confirmed by the U.S. Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the biographical information on Mr. Clements.

There being no objection, the biographical information was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION OF WILLIAM P. CLEMENTS, JR.

Name: William P. Clements, Jr.
Address: 4622 Meadowood Road, Dallas, Texas 75220.

Business: Chairman of the Board, SEDCO, Inc., Cumberland Hill, 1901 North Akard, Dallas, Texas 75201.

Date of Birth: April 13, 1917. Birthplace: Dallas, Texas.

Wife's Maiden Name: Pauline Gill. Birthplace: Terrell, Texas.

Children: B. Gill Clements and Nancy Clements Seay.

Schools Attended: Highland Park High School and Southern Methodist University.

Club Memberships: Northwood Country Club; Dallas Petroleum Club; Eldorado Country Club.

Church Memberships: St. Michael and All Angels Episcopal Church.

CIVIC ORGANIZATIONS AND BUSINESS

Chairman, Board of Governors, Southern Methodist University.

Board of Trustees, Southern Methodist University.

President, South Central Region, Boy Scouts of America.

Past President, Circle Ten Council, Boy Scouts of America.

National Executive Board, Boy Scouts of America.

Director and Executive Committee, Dallas Citizens Council.

Trustee, Southwestern Medical School (University of Texas).

Director, First National Bank in Dallas.

Director, Keebler Company.

Director, Fidelity Union Life Insurance Company.

Member, National Petroleum Council.

Director, Independent Petroleum Association of America.

Past President, International Association of Drilling Contractors.

Trustee, Texas Research Foundation.

Member, Advisory Board, Jf. League of Dallas.

Member, 1972 National United Nations Day Committee.

Director, Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association.

Life Member, Navy League of the United States.

Member, Steering Committee of Dallas County Committee for the White House Conference on Children and Youth.

Member, Blue Ribbon Defense Panel.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, does the Senator from South Carolina wish to make a statement now?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 3 minutes?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise in support of the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Clements to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

In the hearings before the Committee on Armed Services, I was deeply impressed with Mr. Clements. I was impressed with his sincerity. I was impressed by all I have learned about him and heard about him. He is a man of integrity. I was further impressed by his great ability, his great capacity to get things done. He is a hard-headed businessman.

I was further impressed with the simple, direct manner in which he answered questions. There was no attempt at evasion; there was no attempt to hide anything; and he struck me as a man who was going to speak the truth. He has promised to come before the committees and to answer questions when we need him.

It is my judgment that President Nixon has made a wise choice selection in naming this man of experience, this successful man in business, this man of character and ability to fill this important position of Deputy Secretary of Defense. I do not know of any position in government that carries more responsibility than this particular office. He will be responsible for the awarding of contracts involving billions of dollars. He will be responsible, together with the Secretary of Defense, for providing the military machine that is going to keep this country free and enable it to survive.

Mr. President, also impressive is the nominee's obvious interest in improving defense procurement procedures. Despite improvements over the past few years I am convinced the Government can tighten its belt and the belt of the defense contractors.

In reply to a question by me during the hearings, Mr. Clements declared:

I would like to see us tighten up controls in procurement.

He then went on to express his interest in reducing the paperwork which abounds in the Pentagon, the need to have a strong research and development program and the importance of obtaining better procurement contracts for the military services.

Mr. President, Mr. Clements made another statement which impressed me, and I believe my colleagues will also be impressed. The question involved the handling of the public's money. Mr. Clements will unquestionably be directly involved in handling larger sums of Gov-

ernment money than most if not all others in the executive agencies.

In reply to my interest in this area, the nominee stated:

I feel there is a fiduciary responsibility in handling the government's money, and I would be inclined to be even more careful with it than my own, and I want you to know I am very careful with my own.

Mr. President, I fully support the necessary defense programs for this country despite the sometimes awesome cost involved. However, there is no reason the necessary weapons cannot be obtained through well regulated business procedures designed to achieve the maximum for the money expended.

Therefore, it appears to me the country is fortunate to obtain the services of a man of Mr. Clements' business background to undertake the responsibilities of Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Mr. President, it is my hope that the Senate will approve this nomination with dispatch.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in order that the Senator from Iowa may ask questions of me, I yield to him for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

The Senator from Iowa has some questions relating to the financial interest of Mr. Clements. I have asked the distinguished chairman of the committee about the disposition of those financial interests. I think it is important that I point out to the Senate that although the stock holdings of Mr. Clements in the First National Bank of Dallas were listed for the committee among his financial holdings, the relationship of the First National Bank of Dallas to companies engaged in the manufacture of weapons systems for the Government were not disclosed to the committee at that time. It was not until I was contacted by a newspaper reporter that I found that there was, as a matter of fact, such a financial tie-in.

So my questions relate to the disposition of that stock. I wish to ask the chairman in relationship to the article in the newspaper, if he would contact Mr. Clements to find out the extent of his holdings of that stock and what his intentions of disposition would be in relation to the stock he holds in the bank. I would not expect the chairman to respond on the amount of the holdings of the shares of stock, but I do believe that, for the record of the Senate in considering this nomination, the disposition of the stock in the First National Bank of Dallas should be made known to the Senate.

I wish to ask the chairman if it is in his power to do that.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I think I can answer the Senator's question. In the first place, Mr. Clements fully disclosed to us that he was a stockholder and member of the board of directors of the First National Bank of Dallas. Of course, that bank is not on what we call the Department of Defense master list

of those who contract with or do business with the Department of Defense. So under the rules we felt it would not require him to dispose of the stock.

But as the facts developed, and as called to my attention by the Senator from Iowa, there was an account in that bank by which credit to one of those large contractors had been extended. The credit to the large contractor, who dealt with manufacturing airplanes, for instance, had run into very large sums of money.

I called Mr. Clements on the telephone and talked to him about that. It was yesterday afternoon when this matter came to my attention. He readily said that if there was any question about it he would be glad to, and would, resign as a member of the board of directors of the bank and sell whatever stock he had in the bank.

His interest was so small it had not seemed significant but, as a matter of getting everything ready to bring the nomination on, I was glad he saw fit to do what he did with respect to this.

The Senator from Iowa is certainly within reason in bringing up this point. I do want to make this point, though. We do not want this to set a precedent for every nominee for this office, who happens to own some bank stock, under which they would be asked by the committee and by the Senate to dispose of any bank stock before they could discharge the duties of office.

I think that covers the situation. I have a letter from Mr. Clements. I ask unanimous consent that his letter of January 23 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEDCO, INC.,
January 23, 1973.

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS,
Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As I have informed you, I own stock in the First National Bank of Dallas. Since the First National Bank of Dallas is not on the statistical list of prime contractors, I had not considered that there was any problem with my retention of that stock.

Since I understand that some question has been raised concerning my retention of the stock in the First National Bank of Dallas, please be advised that should I be confirmed by the Senate, I will divest myself of all stock in the First National Bank of Dallas.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. CLEMENTS, JR.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Mississippi has expired. Who yields time?

MR. HUGHES. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may need.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

MR. HUGHES. Mr. President, the Senate has under consideration, as pointed out by the chairman, the nomination of William F. Clements, Jr. for the position of First Deputy Secretary of Defense, which is a position of awesome responsibility and of great moral challenge.

By his own testimony, Mr. Clements

has rated this position for which he has been nominated as one of the most important in government.

On page 137 of the hearings before the Committee on Armed Services he made the following statement.

MR. CLEMENTS. Mr. Chairman, I think that our posture with respect to the Department of Defense must carry a No. 1 priority above anything else: that without a strong Defense Department, why we really wouldn't have, and probably can't have these other domestic problems to be concerned with; that the President in all of his negotiations must be supported by a position of strength in the Department of Defense."

As First Deputy Secretary, Mr. Clements would share a substantial part of the burden of managing the largest and oldest and most expensively financed bureaucracy in this Nation, and he would stand ready to assume the leadership of the Department of Defense whenever circumstances require the Secretary to be absent.

Of particular importance is the role that Mr. Clements would play in the administration of weapons development and procurement programs, which absorb more than \$20 billion a year of Federal outlays. While his duties in this respect have not yet been delineated, Mr. Clements told the committee that he believes they will, in his words—

Probably closely follow the pattern set by Mr. Laird and Mr. Packard.

If that proves to be the case, Mr. President, he will have a major responsibility relating to the weapons capabilities of the military services and the performance of the defense contracts who develop and produce these weapons.

Considering the weight and scope of these responsibilities, it should not be surprising that the Senate would take unusual care and give thorough consideration to the qualifications of such a man.

It should not be surprising that Senators would explore the general and basic philosophy of the nominee regarding the use of military force.

Nor should it be surprising that the Senate would want to examine in detail the nominee's personal financial situation and its relationship to the defense contractors who would be directly affected by his decisions and recommendations.

In the case of Mr. Clements' administrative skills and managerial capabilities, his qualifications are impressive. But his philosophical views of the role of military power at this point in history are deeply troubling to me.

He professed a continued commitment, in his testimony before the committee, to the notion that the destructive nuclear capability of this Nation must be superior to all others.

When asked by the distinguished Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) whether he still supports the concept that "the only viable national strategy is to regain and retain a clearly superior strategic capability," Mr. Clements replied that he does. And he reaffirmed that support unequivocally when I put the same question to him later in the hearing.

Mr. President, it has been our addiction to "superiority" that has produced the terrorizing nuclear arsenals that are stockpiled around the world—one nation striving to surpass the other in the effectiveness and destructiveness of their nuclear weapons.

A commitment to "superiority" is an alien commitment in a government whose President has declared his policy to be only "sufficiency to deter aggression" and has demanded adherence to the concept of "mutual, balanced" adjustments among the military forces of nations.

In further pursuit of Mr. Clements' personal philosophy, I sought to establish what his feelings were toward the use of nuclear weapons, particularly in a limited war such as the one that has dominated the efforts of this Nation for more than a decade.

He responded that he would not rule it out, and later he made it clear that, notwithstanding his personal inclinations, he would respect and carry out the President's policy repudiating the use of nuclear weapons in Indochina, and would adopt it as his own.

Mr. Clements' answers to this and certain other questions suggest that he was expressing some of his fundamental personal philosophy and was willing to do so even when it was at variance with the policies of the President.

However, the nominee gave repeated assurances that, as an appointee who would serve at the pleasure of the President, he would be obedient to the orders he would receive from the Commander in Chief. But the President could not be expected to maintain continuous watch over the occupant of so important a position.

And in examining the qualifications of such a man, the Senate should not, and does not, overlook the principles that guide his thinking and can be expected to mold his recommendations to the President. Nor is the Senate disinterested in the gut feelings that would indicate to his subordinates what kind of recommendations the nominee would receive most favorably from them.

I think the philosophy of such a nominee is extremely important—he is in a position to advise on the development of systems; it would be well known to everyone working under him at the agency that he would welcome recommendations that might reinforce his philosophy.

Hearings by a committee of the Senate are usually the only organized effort on behalf of the citizens of the Nation to explore the fundamental philosophy of Presidential appointees, and the Senate does not take this responsibility lightly.

In this instance, Mr. President, the hearings of the Committee on Armed Services were unusually extensive and thorough, for which the distinguished chairman, Mr. STENNIS, has earned the gratitude of the Senate, and also the Senator from Iowa.

The chairman of the committee has made every endeavor to cover every field, he has had patience in the length of questions put to the nominees who appeared before that committee, and he

January 23, 1973

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 1141

is to be congratulated for this effort in behalf of the Senate.

In examining the nominees' personal financial arrangements to insure against potential conflicts of interest, the committee took special care in studying the statements submitted by the nominees and arranged for them to be published with the hearings.

In Mr. Clements' case, he offered, in his letter to the committee, to resign from several positions and dispose of one stock he held in a corporation that does substantial business with the Department of Defense.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of his letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEDCO, Inc.,
January 8, 1973.

Hon. JOHN C. STENNIS,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is submitted in connection with my nomination as Deputy Secretary of Defense which is now pending before your Committee on the question of advice and consent to the nomination in order to advise you of my financial interests as they relate to the position for which I have been nominated.

At the present time, I have a financial interest, as indicated, in the following companies:

Company and Nature of Interests:

1. Clemgl Realty, Inc.—President; Trustee for stockholders.

2. SEDCO, Inc.—Chairman of Board; stock; salary; participant in profit sharing plan.

Subsidiaries:

(a) Baylor Company—Director; stock in parent corporation.

(b) Southeastern Commonwealth Drilling, Ltd. (Canadian)—President; Director; stock in parent corporation.

(c) Southeastern Oceanic Drilling Co.—President; stock in parent corporation.

(d) Southeastern Drilling Services, Ltd. (UK)—Director; stock in parent corporation.

(e) Southeastern Drilling, Inc.—President and Director; stock in parent corporation.

3. First National Bank of Dallas—Director; stock.

4. Fidelity Union Life Co.—Director; stock.

5. Keebler Company—Director; stock.

6. Various tracts of real estate—Ownership.

With reference to my financial interests in SEDCO, Inc., I propose, if confirmed, to take leave of absence from the firm and its subsidiaries. I will receive no salary or other compensation. While I will retain my vested interests in SEDCO's profit sharing plan, no contributions will be made to my interest in the profit sharing plan during my absence while serving in a government post. I would propose to retain my stock interest in SEDCO, Inc. Although one of SEDCO's subsidiaries has in the past done some small amounts of business with the Department of Defense, the Board of Directors of SEDCO, Inc., on 29 December 1972, adopted the following resolutions:

"Resolved.—That neither SEDCO, Inc., nor any of its divisions, subsidiaries or affiliates shall henceforth perform any work for the Department of Defense of the United States Government except work granted as a result of a public tender.

"Resolved.—That neither SEDCO, Inc., nor any of its divisions, subsidiaries, or affiliates shall henceforth submit bids (either by public tender or private offer) for work for the Department of Defense of the United States Government in view of its past experience

in performing such work, the low profit margins involved and the drain upon its manpower and resources."

Of the remaining companies in which I currently own stock, there is one on the Statistical List of Prime Defense Contractors, which is Keebler Company. Should the Senate confirm my nomination, I will sell my stock in this company within ninety days of the time I take office.

In addition to my investments, I am Chairman of the Board of Governors of Southern Methodist University, which is also on the Statistical List of Prime Defense Contractors. If confirmed, I intend to resign this position.

I am also a member of the National Petroleum Council, and a Director of the International Association of Drilling Contractors and the Independent Petroleum Association, from which positions I will also resign should my nomination be confirmed.

I trust that these proposals comply with the Committee's rules and I sincerely hope your Committee will approve of this plan.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM P. CLEMENTS, JR.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, in his letter, Mr. Clements stated that he is a member of the board of directors, and a stockholder, of the First National Bank of Dallas.

That was the question to which the chairman of the committee, Mr. STENNIS, was referring in the discussion relating to the questions of the Senator from Iowa just a few minutes ago.

In the letter Mr. Clements stated that he was a member of the board of directors of the First National Bank of Dallas. He did not, however, declare that he would resign from that position or arrange to dispose of his stock, nor did he disclose the extent of his stockholding in the bank at that point.

The Senator from Iowa even now is still in ignorance of the extent of the stockholdings. He is willing to rely on the word of the chairman of the committee that those holdings are very minimal, as he explained to the Senator from Iowa on the floor of the Senate in public debate, but up to this time the nominee has not disclosed to the committee the extent of the holdings of that stock.

Moreover, Mr. President, the committee was not made aware of information which would have alerted us to the very close financial ties that exist between First National and a major defense contractor, Ling-Temco-Vought.

LTV, as you know, Mr. President, is a large, diversified corporation that includes as one of its principal subsidiaries Vought Aeronautics, maker of the A-7 attack fighter that has been so extensively employed by both the Navy and the Air Force.

This aircraft has emerged as a controversial one at this time, with reports that it is being touted as an ideal aircraft for the use of the Air Force in providing close air support for ground troops.

At the same time, however, the Air Force has decided to award a contract to the Fairchild-Hiller Corp. for the further development and ultimate production of a specialized aircraft, the A-10, for the close air support mission.

The Washington Post on January 19 of this year carried a story reporting on the contract award and the effort to promote the A-7 aircraft for close air sup-

port. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the article be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, a contest between the two aircraft, if it does materialize, would undoubtedly require important decisions at the highest level of the Department of Defense, and in his role as First Deputy Secretary, Mr. Clements may be expected to participate in any such decisions.

This matter came to my attention over the weekend from a newspaper article by Patrick Sloyan, published in a number of major cities by the Hearst Newspapers. I ask unanimous consent that the article be reprinted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, to avoid a conflict of interest, Mr. Clements only last night, after a phone call from the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, agreed to dispose of the stock he held in the First National Bank of Dallas. He did not come before the Armed Services Committee and honestly say to us: "Yes, I am a holder of stock in the bank that has extended lines of credit in relationship to the competition that can develop on this aircraft." No matter how minimal it may be, he did not do that.

I would point out, Mr. President, that in relation to other minimal holdings, it was recommended by the legal counsel of the Pentagon that the holdings were so minimal that they considered allowing him to retain ownership of this other stock, and after due consideration, the committee allowed it. However, why were we not given the opportunity in the light of day, before we reached the Senate with the nomination, to make a financial examination and question the nominee about his interest in the bank, regardless of how small the holdings might be? He has been a director on the board and has held stock in the bank involved. I believe that his failure to tell us in a timely way has raised a serious question.

The First National Bank of Dallas has extended a line of credit to Ling-Temco-Vought, as I understand it.

Mr. President, I have ascertained from documents on file with the Securities and Exchange Commission that certain LTV subsidiaries have "a revolving line of credit" with First National Bank of Dallas, among other banks, and that on June 30, 1972, these subsidiaries owed First National a total of \$2.565 million.

The Navy has informed my office that Vought Aeronautics has a standing line of credit with First National of \$5.2 million.

By contrast, Mr. Sloyan reported Sunday in the Hearst Newspapers that, according to an LTV spokesman, First National of Dallas was one of several banks backing a \$75 million line of credit for Vought Aeronautics and that the Dallas bank also is sharing in support of a \$25 million term loan. The extent to which First National of Dallas is involved in these arrangements may well be limited

to the figure provided my office by the Navy.

I repeat that it may be limited to the amount provided my office by the Navy. But the Senate will certainly wonder why we never had this information in a timely way brought before the appropriate committee for its consideration before this nomination came to the Senate for confirmation.

The Senator from Iowa does not understand that, in contrast apparently to the other holdings of this man, there was apparently a total unwillingness to discuss this at all with the Senator from Iowa.

I think that some inferences about the relationship between First National and LTV may be drawn from the circumstances surrounding a shakeup in LTV management several years ago. When the management of LTV was undergoing reorganization in 1970, Mr. Robert H. Stewart III, joined the LTV board of directors and, from May 17 to July 9 of that year, served as chairman of the LTV board. Mr. Stewart is also chairman of the board of First International Bankshares, Inc., the holding company which owns First National Bank of Dallas.

Mr. President, until the Senate has an explanation of the extent of Mr. Clements' holdings—which we now have been given by the chairman in general terms—in the First National Bank of Dallas and the extent of the bank's financial relationship with LTV, no competent judgment can be made by the Senate today as to the potential for a conflict of interest in the conduct of Mr. Clements' duties as First Deputy Secretary of Defense.

I regret very much that the Senator from Iowa did not have a complete and timely disclosure of this information to consider, or the Senator from Iowa would have asked the chairman of the Armed Services Committee to recall Mr. Clements for further hearings in relation to this subject. Because that did not happen, the Senator from Iowa is precluded from that parliamentary procedure.

Mr. President, naturally it is within the right of the Senator from Iowa to make a motion to recommit. And I say to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Mississippi, that is not my intention. I know what the result of that vote would be before I would make the motion. I know what would happen to it.

I regret today that there are only seven or eight Senators to listen to the debate and discussion in relation to this matter. But I view what has happened in relation to this disclosure, whether by design or by accident, to be a flaw in the responsibility of Mr. Clements to be totally honest with our committee and with the Senate.

I also view this nominee in a philosophical context as having an important bearing on his judgment in the future as to what is sufficiency and what is superiority, and what kind of develop-

mental advice we will be getting at these levels of our Government.

Mr. President, as the chairman of the committee pointed out, one member of the committee voted "present." He did not vote against it, and he said at that moment that he had nothing in opposition to Mr. Clements.

The member of the committee who voted "present" was the Senator from Iowa. Since voting "present," the Senator from Iowa has had an opportunity to read the printed testimony in relation to the financial interests and disclosures made by Mr. Clements. The Senator from Iowa now has opposition to the appointment.

Naturally the Senator from Iowa is cognizant of the fact that with not many Senators on the floor to debate and with no opportunity for further hearings, the nomination will be confirmed overwhelmingly.

Mr. President, it is my belief that these questions, both philosophical and in relation to the willingness of the nominee to reveal his holdings in toto and to let the committee decide what is important and what is unimportant with reference to his financial interests, divulges a flaw in his ability to serve in this capacity.

It is therefore the intention of the Senator from Iowa to vote against the nomination of Mr. Clements to be First Deputy Secretary of the Department of Defense.

EXHIBIT 1

FAIRCHILD WINS BID ON BELEAGUERED JET

(By Michael Getler)

An intensive, behind-the-scenes political battle is being fought over the future of a new Air Force attack plane contract that was awarded yesterday to Fairchild Industries, Inc., of Hagerstown, Md.

Fairchild won an Air Force competition with California-based Northrop Corp. to build the first 10 test models of a rugged new attack plane known as the AX.

But there is considerable political pressure being brought upon the Air Force, according to authoritative sources in the Pentagon and Congress, to eventually substitute the Texas-manufactured A-7 attack plane for the AX.

Though the contract announced yesterday is only for 10 pre-production prototype AX models, the Air Force has said it plans to build more than 600 of the planes.

The AX would be the first Air Force plane designed specifically for providing heavy aerial firepower in close support of Army ground troops.

The A-7, produced by Ling Temco Vought in Dallas, was developed in 1964 by the Navy and has been in service with both the Navy and Air Force for several years. It has been used extensively in Vietnam for attacking enemy supply lines and in close air support.

In previous years, the biggest inter-service threat to the future of the AX was the Army's proposed Cheyenne helicopter gunship. The Army has maintained that it should play at least a major part in providing its own close air support.

But the trouble-plagued Cheyenne was finally killed several months ago because of cost and technical problems.

Now, with the primary mission of close air support appearing to rest firmly with the Air Force, a new threat to the future of the twin-jet plane designed for that role has emerged.

Informed sources say that at least two Senators on the Senate Armed Services Com-

mittee, and other lawmakers are supplying pressure on the Air Force to buy a modified version of the A-7 rather than the new AX.

The AX was intended to be a low-cost plane, about \$1.4 million each based on 1970 prices. But the manner of the plane's current development may well drive up the cost significantly, in the view of some congressional and military sources.

For example, although the AX is supposed to be an airplane with an uncomplicated design, nearly three more years of testing are expected by the Air Force before a decision to produce the plane will be made. Furthermore, the contractor bids were based on a prospective initial order of only 48 planes. Such a small order would make the initial per-plane price appear to be high.

Proponents of the A-7 claim another cost advantage—the fact that the A-7 assembly line is still running, primarily because of additional Pentagon orders in the last year. The AX, on the other hand, would require an entirely new production line investment.

Yesterday, Thomas V. Jones, president of Northrop, said in a statement, "We are also confident that in the long run, the A-9 (Northrop's losing version of the AX) would have proved to be the lowest cost aircraft system for this mission."

Within the Air Force, there is said to be a squabble over buying the AX because of the A-7's interdiction capabilities against supply lines. Others in the service and the Pentagon are insisting that the specialized goals of close air support be adhered to.

The Pentagon has also been suggesting that it will begin putting Air Force planes on Navy carriers in the future and there is said to be a good possibility that a tail-hook ordered for the AX might also doom its chances to beat off a challenge from the A-7, which can already operate from aircraft carriers.

EXHIBIT 2

WILLIAM CLEMENTS A DIRECTOR AND STOCKHOLDER OF BANK FINANCING JET FIGHTER-BOMBER

(By Patrick J. Sloyan)

WASHINGTON, January 20.—William P. Clements, Jr., the man President Nixon selected to be the No. 2 man at the Pentagon, is listed as a director and stockholder of a Dallas bank that is helping to finance the builder of a controversial jet fighter-bomber.

Clements, whose nomination as Deputy Secretary of Defense comes up for Senate debate this week, has been approved by the Senate Armed Services Committee.

But one Committee member, Sen. Harold Hughes, D-Iowa, said the panel was not told about the link between Clements, the First National Bank of Dallas, and Ling-Temco-Vought, Inc. (LTV), manufacturer of the A-7, a plane used by both the Air Force and the Navy.

Hughes termed it an apparent conflict-of-interest that would be pursued.

If confirmed, Clements would be in a position to influence the selection of the LTV plane over other competitors for a multi-million dollar defense contract.

Clements, in a Jan. 8 letter, told the Committee he was a director and stockholder in the Dallas bank, but was not resigning the post or selling the stock. He did dispose of other stock and resign from other firms that had direct and indirect links with military contracts.

These actions were taken after negotiations between lawyers representing Clements and the Senate committee.

But a Defense Department spokesman said late today that Clements has now told Committee Chairman John C. Stennis, D-Miss., that he will resign as director of the bank following Senate confirmation. The Defense

January 23, 1973

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 1143

official said Clements informed Stennis of his plan to resign after the Jan. 8 letter in which he listed other resignations.

However, Clements plans to retain the bank stock as initially permitted by the Committee, he said. Clements is aware of the bank connection with LTV but believed the link did not warrant reporting to the Committee, the spokesman said.

"We were not told about the bank connection with LTV," Hughes said in an interview. "This is an apparent conflict-of-interest and we're going to have to look into it."

Clements could not be reached for comment.

According to LTV, First National of Dallas was one of several banks backing a \$75 million line of credit for the LTV aerospace subsidiary. The Dallas bank also is sharing in support of a \$25 million term loan, LTV said.

However, neither the bank nor LTV would say how much of the line of credit and term loan was being financed by First National. So far, LTV has used \$33 million of the line of credit, LTV said.

First National at one point had more than just financial interest in LTV. When the parent corporation—one of the first of the big-time conglomerates—suffered losses, its board of directors did some housecleaning.

James Ling, founder of the conglomerate, was ousted as chief executive. Replacing him for a three-month period in 1970 was the president of First National of Dallas, Robert H. Stewart III.

Nixon nominated Clements on the recommendation of Sen. John G. Tower, R-Tex. Tower and Clements served together on the board of directors of Southern Methodist University.

Tower is a leader of the Texas delegation's fight to keep open the A-7 production line at LTV and eventually win for the Dallas firm a contract for hundreds more of the fighter-bombers.

Tower and Chairman George Mahon, D-Tex., of the House Appropriations Committee, hope to win Pentagon approval of a plan to use the A-7 as the chief tactical support plane for U.S. ground soldiers.

Currently, the Air Force wants to develop a new ground support plane, the AX. Only last week, the Pentagon announced that Fairchild Industries of Hagerstown, Md., was the winner of the AX contract for 10 developmental planes.

Eventually, the Air Force hopes to buy 600 of the AX planes.

But some in the Air Force also favor using the LTV A-7 rather than the Fairchild plane.

If confirmed by the Senate, Clements would be in an important position to have a major say about choosing between the A-7 or AX for a 300 to 600 aircraft production run.

Although the A-7 costs more than the AX (about \$2 million compared to \$1.4 million per plane) both the Air Force and Navy believe the A-7 is the more versatile plane.

"The LTV plane has a tremendous all-weather bombing capability as well as ground support," a spokesman for Tower explained. "The AX would be pretty much strictly a ground support plane."

It was Tower and Mahon who rescued LTV last year when plans were under way to halt new purchases of the A-7 and shut down the Dallas production line.

Despite stiff Senate opposition, Mahon and Tower got through an additional \$85.4 million measure for production of 24 more A-7s. This was enough to keep the LTV production line open and give planners the option of picking the A-7 over the AX.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi has 31 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, would the Senator from Mississippi yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield for that purpose.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, was there no division of time for debate as between the nominees? It was the understanding of the Senator from Iowa that we would spend the first hour on the nomination of Mr. Clements and the second hour on the nomination of Mr. Schlesinger.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the agreement there are 2 hours on the two nominations en bloc.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I will be brief. I do ask for quiet, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be order in the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I greatly appreciate the interest of the Senator from Iowa. He has been eminently fair in this, as he always is.

Mr. President, we need to give a little of the background. Just what does this examination consist of with reference to the financial affairs? This is formal testimony, more or less put together by the Armed Services Committee. It is not written into law.

We do have a statute that disqualifies a man from taking part in the negotiations of a contract if he is an official in any company or corporation in which he has an interest. It just says that he has to disqualify himself and he is not eligible to participate. And if he does not disqualify himself, he could be prosecuted.

Mr. President, that is altogether a different matter. That is the law. But here is what we have tried to do. We have what we call the master list. It contains a list of all the people and companies and corporations that do major business with the Pentagon. It is figured out on an annual basis. And on that list are all of those who do \$10,000 or more of business with the Pentagon, or a little less than that.

So we took that master list and ran Mr. Clements' holdings against it. There was no evidence that we had or that he had that the First National Bank of Dallas was doing any business with the Pentagon. The Pentagon did not know it. It was not on their list, and they are not doing any business with the Pentagon.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. HUGHES. I think it is obvious that Mr. Clements knew it, and I would ask the chairman if he would not agree that Mr. Clements knew it.

Mr. STENNIS. No; I could not agree to that. I just do not know. I stand by the statement that the First National Bank of Dallas was not doing any business with the Pentagon.

It happened that the question of credit was not raised to Mr. Clements by anyone. I did not know anything about it—that there was a line of credit with that bank by one of the contractors that does a lot of business with the Department of

Defense. I do not know whether Mr. Clements knows anything about it. I just do not know. I talked to him on the telephone, only, about this matter. In any event Ling-Temco-Vought—we had just as well give the name of it; there is nothing secret about it—has that line of credit.

I do not know how much credit. But anyway, the First National Bank of Dallas was not on the list. There was no way for Mr. Clements to know that he was supposed to sell his stock. He willingly agreed to sell any that we did find any question about. I have never seen any nominee more willing to cooperate with the committee to the fullest extent—to the nth degree—than was this man Clements. I had a 2-hour conference with him; he came to Mississippi to see me about the hearings, and I told him all about the procedures. I have never seen any man more willing, more honest, more frank to disclose everything. I think that is what he did. Everything that I was able to bring up or that he knew anything about.

So we went along with that. Now, the Senator was very prompt, when he learned about this matter. But here is the amount of the First National Bank's stock that the nominee owns. I have gotten this, I had it yesterday, but I did not bring it with me by oversight, and it did not get into the file.

There are 20 million shares, as I am told, of stock of the First National Bank of Dallas outstanding. Now, Mr. Clements owns 3,420 of those shares, of an approximate value of \$171,000. I mentioned this to him yesterday afternoon in that telephone conversation, calling out that number of shares.

Now, how does that compare with the total? Those 3,420 shares are only seventeen one-thousandths of 1 percent. If you know how to write that out in decimals, you can do it; but it is seventeen one-thousandths of 1 percent of the stock in that bank. That is what the man owns; seventeen one-thousandths of 1 percent.

So that is what I was referring to as being so small. How could the man benefit from saving Ling-Temco-Vought in a contract with the Pentagon? Is he going to increase the value of his stock in the First National Bank of Dallas by doing some favor for them in connection with this line of credit? It is so remote, it is just virtually impossible. But when this was called to his attention, frankly, I told him, "Now, if you just want to, let it all go, and we go on with this matter tomorrow," he simply said, "Well, I will just sell all of it."

That is the whole story. So I go back, now, for emphasis, because this is a matter that has not been debated here in the Senate lately, and we have had dozens and hundreds of these cases. We build up a file on them, and get these committals and everything, and we have not had any of them go bad, so to speak. Every man has lived up to what he has promised, but if he did not, we have a record on him and can prove where he falsified to the Senate.

We have had men like the late Charles Wilson, president of General Motors. He sold a whole lot of his stock. I hate to be

personal, but we had Mr. Paul Nitze two or three times before our committee, a man of immense wealth. We had Mr. David Packard 4 years ago, with \$300 million worth of one stock—that much value for only one stock. But we made a special situation there whereby he put it in escrow—put it in trust—and gave all the benefits to charity and educational institutions. To have required him to sell it would have broken the market, of course.

So this is a procedure that was worked out, and it has worked well. It is all fixed beforehand, and I am proud of what the committee has done about it over the years, long before I was chairman.

I do not think that Mr. Clements is guilty of the slightest bit of deceit or misrepresentation or failure to report. Everything has to be considered in the light of what the circumstances were at the time. If I had one scintilla of belief that there was anything wrong about this thing, I would have joined with the Senator from Iowa and said, "We will ask the Senate to let us have that report back, and we will reopen these hearings and pursue this thing from here to kingdom come until we get the facts."

I think the Senator already has all of that, or I think the substance. Although I commend the Senator for his vigilance, I believe the committee had all the substantial facts that had any connection with the matter, so far as Mr. Clements knew. So I hope Senators will use discretion and make a commonsense judgment on this matter, before we pass on it.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield to the Senator from Iowa, or any Senator who wishes to be heard.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 41 minutes.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I have the greatest respect for the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and the distinguished chairman knows that better than any other Member of this body, in our own personal relationship with each other. The Senator from Mississippi knows very well that the Senator from Iowa does not question his integrity, his thoroughness, or his willingness to investigate matters such as this.

We have had a very interesting development, however, here on the floor of the Senate today, Mr. President. We have seen a willingness to disclose not only the number of shares of stock held in a corporation, but the value of those shares, apparently, so far as I know for the first time in a long time.

In an attempt to make it look as though the Senator from Iowa is trying to kill a mosquito with a telephone pole, the distinguished chairman of the committee is saying this is only seventeen one-thousandths of 1 percent of all the stock held.

Mr. President, the distinguished chairman misses the point entirely. The point is the willingness to voluntarily state what you own. We can determine whether it is insignificant or not. Surely the Senator from Iowa knows the differ-

ence between an infected hair and a boil, but he has to see both to be able to describe the difference.

But let us be cautious when it is to their advantage to say that it is insignificant. Surely the Senator from Iowa might have reached that conclusion, had a willingness to give the information to the committee voluntarily appeared. But the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, though believing expressly in the integrity of the gentleman from Texas being appointed to this prominent position, still offers to the Senator from Iowa no explanation that sounds logical to the Senator from Iowa as to why there was nothing but silence from the nominee on this subject.

Mr. President, I do not want to belabor the point of the significance or the insignificance of seventeen one-thousandths of 1 percent of the total stock of the First National Bank of Dallas that was not willingly disclosed to the committee. The Senator from Iowa would again point out that Mr. Clements was a director on the board of the bank. For all I know, the lines of credit that had been then extended to this manufacturer of aircraft being bought by the Defense Department may be only nine one-thousandths of 1 percent of the line of credit they have extended to other corporations. I do not know what the relationship is. I did not have the opportunity to examine it. The Senator from Iowa has not been able to get the information in time to have any effect on this debate. But the Senator from Iowa still thinks it is important that on any nomination considered by the Senate, by the country, by the President—and certainly by the appointee himself, when he is to assume one of the most important positions in our Nation—it is important for him to fulfill, if nothing more, his individual responsibility in trying to disclose to the American people everything that can be disclosed philosophically, financially, and in every other way, in relationship to this nominee.

So, Mr. President, the points that the Senator from Iowa originally made still stand, so far as he is concerned, unchallenged.

In the philosophical context, I believe the nominee is in disagreement with the policies of the Chief Executive, and undoubtedly these differences in philosophy will have an impact on those making recommendations to the nominee and on the nominee's recommendations to the White House.

The Senator from Iowa wants to point out that perhaps it is possible Mr. Clements did not know of the existing lines of credit to LTV, and the Senator from Iowa has no way of knowing that and, in all fairness and candor, the Senator from Iowa wants to point that out—but it would seem to the Senator from Iowa that, being on the board of directors of the bank extending large lines of credit to a corporation that was, indeed, in the manufacture of aircraft being bought by the Pentagon, the nominee might have made the effort to find out whether there was any involvement in those contracts that might prove embarrassing to him, or to the Pentagon, in the processes of the hearings or the debate. That was not

done. So the Senator from Iowa is saying that if there was an oversight, it was a grave error. If he was unaware, he had the responsibility of being aware. Because I know this man will be confirmed today, the Senator from Iowa will have to share the hope of all that the integrity was there and that the willingness to disclose was there and that, somehow, in the frustrations and the pressures, the hearings, and so forth, it was an oversight.

I wish that could be confirmed on the floor of the Senate today. If it could, it would make the Senator from Iowa feel much more comfortable in the aftermath of this debate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri will state it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Who is controlling the time?

Mr. STENNIS. I control the time for the committee report.

Mr. SYMINGTON. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, were we not going to start discussion at 3 p.m. today and vote at 4 p.m.?

Mr. STENNIS. We have the Schlesinger matter coming up next. Does the Senator wish to speak on the Clements nomination?

Mr. SYMINGTON. No, I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I appreciate again the presentation of the distinguished Senator from Iowa. The reference to the small amount of stock was not 17 one-thousandths of the total stock, but 17 one-thousandths of 1 percent of the total stock in the First National Bank. That is why I say it makes it such a small matter.

Now, Mr. President, I do not care to take any further time of the Senate on this matter.

I have a statement here covering his statement about his resignation from all the board of directorships that he is a member of, except the executive board of the Boy Scouts of America.

HIGHLIGHTS REGARDING FINANCIAL HOLDINGS MATTER OF MR. CLEMENTS

Mr. President, the letter of Mr. Clements, page 173 of committee hearing—to the chairman—sets forth the financial matter. He indicated that he will sell the Keebler stock which is on the list within 90 days after confirmation. He quotes a resolution, a certified copy of which is in the committee files, from the SEDCO Corp. stating that it will henceforth accept no Department of Defense work. He also indicates that he will resign certain directorships.

In a subsequent letter of January 22, in order to clarify any doubt he indicates that he will resign all directorships except membership on the executive board of Boy Scouts of America. He subsequently indicated that he would sell the stock in the First National Bank of Dallas. This stock is not on the master list but the press has noted that this bank is one of the main creditors for a major defense contractor of LTV.

Mr. Clements has agreed to sell his

January 23, 1973

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 1145

bank stock and this will be done within 90 days after he assumes office.

Let me emphasize that this matter has arisen entirely after the committee hearings had been completed and was called to my attention only yesterday by Senator HUGHES.

I want to emphasize that the sale of this bank stock should not be considered a precedent insofar as the sale of stock not on the defense master list is concerned. In view of the need to have Mr. Clements confirmed as quickly as possible and on the job there is not the time to fully weigh all aspects of this matter and, therefore, in the interest of time this matter has been resolved as I have indicated which is to sell the bank stock.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter dated January 22, 1973, to me as chairman.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEDCO, INC.,
January 22, 1973.

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In order to confirm for the record what I have previously informed you personally, please be advised that should I be confirmed as Deputy Secretary of Defense, I will resign all the Directorships which I now hold except my position on the National Executive Board of the Boy Scouts of America.

Sincerely,

W. P. CLEMENTS.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, so far as I am personally concerned, that would conclude the debate on this nomination.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa will state it.

Mr. HUGHES. As I understand it, there was no division of time on the question of debate, so that debate could be brought up at any time prior to 4 p.m.; is that not correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUGHES. Inasmuch as I have the floor for a minute, I should like to explain to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi that I do not intend to oppose the nomination of Mr. Schlesinger but to support it; so that I do not have any right to handle the time of anyone who may be in opposition to it.

Mr. STENNIS. I have asked the Senator to handle the time, anyway. We are making progress and getting the Senator from Iowa on our side.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Would the distinguished Senator permit me to make a statement on the nomination of Mr. Schlesinger at this time?

Mr. STENNIS. Oh, yes, I am glad to yield for that purpose.

THE PROPOSED NOMINATIONS OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE RICHARDSON AND CIA DIRECTOR SCHLESINGER

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in the Democratic Policy Committee, it was

agreed that probably the best time to ask nominees for appointment in the executive branch about their concept of the activities of the position in question was when they came before the Senate for confirmation.

With that premise, I asked and received unanimous consent to submit a list of written questions to Secretary of Defense-designate Elliot Richardson. I also wrote a letter to the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee and ask unanimous consent that a copy of this letter be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 15, 1973.

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Because of pressure to confirm these three positions even prior to the Inauguration, I will attempt to have some questions which I believe should be answered in your hands by this evening. I refer to the nominations of Secretary Richardson, Deputy Secretary Clements and Director Schlesinger. May I say with great respect, however, that there would seem to me no need for such a rush.

In that, in effect, Mr. Schlesinger will hand up an organization of thousands of men which in at least one country has been directing United States activity in a war over a period of years, I had hoped the hearing on him could have been open, understand that was the original plan.

The CIA Director reports directly, and only, to the President. He therefore heads up what could well be called the "President's Army," comparable to the former British concept of "the King's Men" (the letter in no way reported to the Parliament).

I believe the American people should have the right to have a look at the man now nominated to head up that Army; otherwise there can only be further disrespect for the true role of the Senate, and a further lack of confidence in Government in general.

Sincerely,

STUART SYMINGTON.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the hearings on the newly appointed Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, James Schlesinger, for whom, based on my experience as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I have both admiration and respect, were held in executive session. As my letter to Chairman STENNIS presents, inasmuch as the CIA, an agency which has conducted U.S. operations in the long and costly Laotian war—a war that has cost the taxpayers of America billions of dollars—in effect, in an operation of this character, functions without any meaningful legislative supervision as the "President's Army," I would hope that at some time there be a public hearing, so the people of this country could know more about the leader of this Army.

I ask unanimous consent that the group of questions I asked originally of Secretary Richardson be inserted at this point in the RECORD, as well as Secretary Richardson's replies to the questions.

There being no objection, the questions and answers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUESTIONS OF MR. RICHARDSON BY SENATOR SYMINGTON, SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Question. In an answer to Senator Thurmond (p. 27 of the January 9 transcript) you agreed that in supporting a "clear sufficiency" of U.S. military strength, you meant superiority over the Soviet Union.

What does superiority mean in the field of strategic nuclear weapons?

Answer. The term superiority as applied to the field of strategic nuclear weapons is currently most frequently used to describe that period in which the United States enjoyed a marked advantage in numbers of nuclear weapons deliverable to a potential enemy's territory. In responding to Senator Thurmond's question as to the equivalence of the term "clear sufficiency" with the term "superiority" I stated, "I think this is essentially correct, Senator Thurmond, taking into account our capabilities as a whole, including our technological capability, and keeping in view the objective of deterring aggression." As I use the term "clear sufficiency" of U.S. military strength, I intend the term to mean a strategic weapons capability unambiguously capable of deterring any other Nation from resorting to the use or threat of use of strategic nuclear weapons for the settlement of international differences, since the level of a clearly sufficient United States military posture would make such an alternative by another Nation unacceptably unattractive.

Question. Would not any effort to achieve superiority mean an effort to gain a first-strike capability?

Answer. No. Neither this Administration, nor to the best of my knowledge, any other administration has followed a policy of attempting to attain a first-strike capability.

Question. How do you square this with your statement (p. 107) that the United States should not take steps that are subject to a primary interpretation that they are intended as a move toward the development of a first-strike capability.

Answer. There is no inconsistency whatsoever.

Question. Doesn't an effort to achieve superiority necessarily mean an intensification of the nuclear arms race?

Answer. No. I believe that we have maintained a clear sufficiency in the strategic weapons field throughout the past four years, during which period the President has been able to obtain the ABM treaty and the interim agreement on offensive weapons. Certainly neither of these agreements could be characterized as an intensification of the nuclear arms race.

Question. You have stated your view that Vietnamization is a success and that the South Vietnamese can defend themselves. At the same time, you indicated that successful Vietnamization permitting the disengagement of United States forces and even with the return of American prisoners of war would not be a satisfactory solution.

Do you support renewed bombing of North Vietnam to achieve some objectives beyond these?

Answer. I do support Presidential objectives beyond the successful disengagement of U.S. forces and the return of our prisoners of war. Some of the additional objectives I support are to obtain an accounting of Americans missing-in-action, and an end to the conflict in Southeast Asia. I also support the objective that the people of South Vietnam be given a reasonable opportunity to determine their own political destiny without attempts from outside South Vietnam to impose by military aggression a political system upon them. I am very hopeful that the current negotiations will further these objectives. I am not prepared to hypothesize as to what military contingencies I would be prepared to support in order to accomplish such objectives since it is not clear

to me at this time that our objective of the return of our American prisoners of war could be clearly distinguished and secured in the absence of some progress also toward the additional objectives which I have mentioned.

Question: What further additional objectives should we seek by bombing the populated areas of North Vietnam?

Answer: It is my understanding that the United States has targeted only military targets in North Vietnam and has not targeted populated populations. I do not believe that any objectives of the United States will be furthered by targeting civilian populations, and I know of no one who has advocated or suggested such a course. As you know, the President has ordered the cessation of all bombing, shelling and mining of North Vietnam, and I support that Presidential action.

Question: Are these objectives sufficiently important to warrant the alienation of our allies such as Canada, Australia and West Germany?

Answer: I do not believe that the actions taken by the United States have alienated our allies. Further, I am certain that such misapprehensions with and misunderstandings of our actions in Vietnam as may have arisen can be at least mitigated and hopefully entirely overcome when the circumstances related to the negotiations which make it imperative now to discuss fully our activities in detail no longer pertain, and when an official account of what has actually transpired in the negotiations can be preached to our allies.

Question: Is our interest in the stability of Southeast Asia so great that the United States should be willing to remain indefinitely in a state of war?

Answer: It has been the President's constant goal to terminate U.S. involvement in the war and to end the war itself. The President's proposal of May 8, 1972, delineates clearly and succinctly the minimum objectives of the United States for ending the armed conflict in Southeast Asia. The President's statement, in connection with the announcement of May 8, 1972, proposals, well expresses the extent of the interest of the United States in the stability of Southeast Asia, and I do not believe it is either necessary or desirable to expand upon the President's quite comprehensive explanation.

Question: You expressed the belief that a genuine interest of the United States is at stake in Southeast Asia.

What is that interest?

Answer: The United States does have a genuine interest in the method of resolution of international disputes by means that avoid armed aggression in any part of the world. The United States has numerous international commitments, and the manner of fulfillment of these commitments can affect the credibility of our mutual security agreements. In the case of the conflict in Southeast Asia, the commitment of the United States under President Nixon's policy is being fulfilled, first, through the policy of Vietnamization which makes unnecessary the use of U.S. ground forces and, second, through the President's proposals of May 8, 1972, for the termination of the Southeast Asian conflict. World stability and order are clearly in the interest of the United States.

Question: Does it involve in any way the containment of China?

Answer: No.

Question: Does it relate to the retention of American bases?

Answer: No.

Question: If a cease fire is achieved and American prisoners of war are returned, would that interest require the resumption of U.S. air warfare if North Vietnam and the Viet Cong violate the cease fire?

Answer: It would not be appropriate for me to presume a violation of a cease fire agreement that has not even yet been con-

summated, nor would it be appropriate for me to speculate on actions, military or otherwise, which might be considered should other prospective signatories to an agreement not yet consummated be violated to some unspecified extent and at some undetermined future time.

4. You have indicated your support for the President's unilateral actions in invading Cambodia, mining Haiphong and using carpet bombing by B-52s as a negotiating instrument.

What, in your opinion, are the limits on the President's exclusive authority to make war?

Answer: First, I would like to note that under the Constitution, the President's decisions as Commander-in-Chief are required to be unilateral for only he is designated as Commander-in-Chief. Those decisions on military operations made by President Nixon were made as Commander-in-Chief in the context of a state of hostilities that began before he became President. The President was not an initiator of a new conflict. Secondly, I do not believe I have ever suggested or concurred that the President was in your words "using carpet bombing by B-52s as a negotiating instrument". As I have stated previously, the United States has targeted only military targets.

When the President finds the country engaged in armed hostilities by whatever means those hostilities arose, he has the responsibility as Commander-in-Chief to direct the military operations of the Armed Forces of the United States in that conflict.

Question: Do these limits go beyond the subjective elements of his self-restraint and the dictates of his conscience?

Answer: The limits on a President of the United States are many and varied, ranging across the spectrum of checks and balances flowing from the provisions of our Constitution. Indeed, the restraints range from the requirement for Congressional appropriations to the requirement for confirmation of every Presidential appointee in the Government, including commissioned officers in the Armed Services. In addition to the checks and balances in the Constitution, there are a wide number and variety of constraining factors which must be considered, including, but not limited to, the overall foreign policy objectives as well as the economic and political well-being of the Nation. Indeed, in no other form of Government are the actions of the Chief Executive and Commander-in-Chief so safeguarded as in our Constitutional Republic.

Question: Why cannot Congress at least be consulted arbitrary Presidential military action occurs?

Answer: Again, I question whether the term "arbitrary" can appropriately be applied to decisions on military operations made by the President as Commander-in-Chief. By the Constitution, the President is Commander-in-Chief, and I certainly concur with the conclusion of the framers of the Constitution, that the national security of the Nation requires that the Chief Executive be vested with sole power as Commander-in-Chief. Accordingly, I do not believe that it is appropriate to characterize the President's execution of his Commander-in-Chief responsibilities as "arbitrary."

Both the time constraints related to military operations and the sensitivity of the interrelationship between military actions and negotiations for peace can, and on occasions do, militate against prior consultations with the Congress to the degree which some might believe desirable and which under other circumstances might be possible and appropriate.

Question: Do you really regard Congressional participation in seeking to control military action by the United States as "an extraneous factor"? (p. 73)

Answer: I think what is involved is the

concern on the part of the President and those who are charged by him with the responsibility for the negotiating process that Congressional action cutting off funds under any specified conditions could be interpreted, in effect, as undercutting the negotiating position of the United States and inducing the other side to hold out for terms that they might not otherwise seek. What we are dealing with is essentially a process that by its very nature requires a direct day-to-day confrontation of negotiators representing each side. Actions by the Congress under such circumstances dealing with the support of military action by the United States which is interrelated and intertwined with these day-to-day negotiations could be counterproductive to the accomplishment of our objective of a cease fire in Southeast Asia.

Question: You have stated that the United States should make no reductions in our military forces in NATO because of the pendency of negotiations on mutually imbalanced force reductions. These negotiations have been described as possibly the most complex in the entire area of arms control.

Does this mean that throughout the years of the MBFR talks we should continue to maintain some 300,000 American military personnel in Europe?

Answer: While I am hopeful that the mutual and balanced force reduction negotiations could result in meaningful agreement in less than a period of years, it must surely be apparent that unilateral reductions in our military capability in Europe, while such negotiations are in progress, would be force reductions which are neither mutual nor balanced and could, in my opinion, jeopardize not only the potential for success in the MBFR talks but also jeopardize the continued viability of NATO's effective deterrent and the security of both Europe and the United States. As you know, NATO has deterred war in Europe for a quarter century.

Question: If this is the result, can we afford such arms control negotiations?

Answer: Not only can we afford arms control negotiations, but I am convinced that the maintenance of an effective force in Europe by the United States is a sound investment and one which we can ill afford not to afford.

Question: Why would not a smaller, leaner and more combat-ready force give us at least equal bargaining strength?

Answer: Substantial progress has already been made in the last four years in stripping the fat from our military forces in NATO and in improving their combat readiness. This effort to improve the efficiency of our forces and to enhance their combat readiness should, of course, continue; and I anticipate that additional personnel can be shifted from support to combat-type assignments within NATO, but I would not want to suggest that this process will result in a substantial reduction of the U.S. forces now in Europe. As you know, the Nixon Doctrine states a willingness to negotiate, but only from a position of strength and partnership. I believe the success of this policy was proved in SALT I.

Question: You've stated the belief that the defense budget cannot be reduced in dollar terms but that it can become a smaller proportion of the total budget. Nevertheless there are bound to be sharp increases in defense spending unless some significant areas of cost saving can be found.

Where would you plan to look for such cost savings?

Answer: Initially, I believe that cost savings may be possible in the personnel area. Conceptually, I am convinced that a part of the answer can lie in improved personnel utilization. In the professional areas, I believe we can make a greater use of paraprofessionals. Through increased reliability across the life cycle of our weapon systems, personnel requirements for maintenance

January 23, 1973

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 1147

can be reduced. For another thing, we must continue to implement civilianization programs.

While it is not easily to generalize in so complex an area as weapons acquisition, I do believe that we should continue to increase the application of the concept of designing to cost. We should also pursue prototyping wherever it is feasible and continue to limit concurrency of development and production to the maximum extent consistent with the imperatives of a successful deterrent.

Question. In your answers rejecting the reduction of our troops in Europe because of MBFR and approving the decision to go ahead with the ABM as essential to success in SALT I, you clearly support the "bargaining chip" argument.

Doesn't this argument validate accelerated development of weapons systems?

Answer. I have never to my knowledge stated that force structure decisions for our Armed Forces should be made solely on the basis of influencing negotiations. Neither, however, do I believe that the United States can afford to neglect the strength of these military forces in the euphoric hope that international agreements can nonetheless be negotiated which will ultimately invalidate the need for such forces. To be successful in negotiations, we must negotiate from strength, and irrespective of negotiations, I believe that our military forces must, in any event, be adequate to constitute a sufficient deterrent and to protect our people, if necessary.

Question. Doesn't this argument give priority to the presumed political impact of weapons systems regardless of their actual military efficacy?

Answer. No.

Question. Doesn't this argument convert negotiations about arms control into an excuse for a stepped-up arms race?

Answer. No.

Question. If this is to be your approach and your advice, how will you prevent massive increases in defense expenditures?

Answer. As I explained in answer to one of the previous questions, the determination of what and how many weapons to acquire should be based on their overall utility in our forces for deterrence in order to keep our military forces strong and to insure that we maintain a superiority in our technological base. As I noted previously, I have in no way suggested that weapons acquisition be accelerated for the sole purpose of influencing negotiations.

Question. You have stated that the United States should not play the role of policeman of the world. You say also, however, that a settlement which gets us out of Southeast Asia and gets our prisoners back, is not satisfactory because the area may remain unstable.

What is so special about that area that should make us the policeman for Southeast Asia?

Answer. The assumption of the question is not correct. We do not believe that the U.S. is a policeman for Southeast Asia. President Nixon's policy has reduced the level of U.S. forces in Vietnam from a ceiling of 549,000 ground combat forces to less than 23,800 military personnel this week. It is under this same policy that President Nixon has pursued the negotiation track to bring about a cease fire and to end the necessity for U.S. military involvement in Southeast Asia. That is why hundreds of thousands of Americans, sent there under previous policies, have come home from Southeast Asia; and that is what the Nixon Doctrine is all about, worldwide.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a group of further questions, contained in my letter to Mr. Richardson of January 18,

1973, directed against his original answers, the replies to which have not yet been received, be inserted at this point in the RECORD. When they are received, I plan to vote for his confirmation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 18, 1973.

HON. ELLIOT L. RICHARDSON,
Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare,
Independence Avenue SW., Washington,
D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Thank you for your answers to my submitted questions. After reading them, I would ask the following:

I remain confused about the meaning you give to the term "clear sufficiency," by "clear sufficiency" do you mean effective deterrence of the use or threatened use of nuclear weapons, and not "superiority"?

At the same time, it would seem that an effort to achieve "superiority" is somehow different from an attempt to attain a first strike capability. Do you favor an attempt to attain nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union?

Alternatively, do you mean that "superiority" means no more than "clear sufficiency"; and if so, do you consider that the Soviet Union presently has a similar "clear sufficiency"? If the latter, does this mean that both countries somehow simultaneously can enjoy "superiority"?

Frankly, your answer to my question with regard to the objectives you would seek to achieve by renewed bombing of North Vietnam is not responsive. You state it is not clear that our objective of the return of our American prisoners of war could be "clearly distinguished and secured" in the absence of some progress toward additional objectives. Did not Dr. Kissinger's October outline of the proposed peace agreement indicate that it would bring about the return of our prisoners and an accounting for all missing in action within 60 days, subject only to the withdrawal of the remaining U.S. forces in South Vietnam? Do you have reason to believe that we cannot now reach this favorable an agreement and that we have missed this opportunity?

My questions did not assert that the United States had targeted civilian populations in North Vietnam. Rather, I referred to the bombing of targets in the populated areas. It is your position that we have not bombed targets in these populated areas? If so, how can one explain the admitted damage to a civilian hospital and to foreign embassies in downtown Hanoi?

Do you believe that the United States could resume the bombing of populated areas in North Vietnam without endangering relations with our allies?

Do you discount as frivolous or insincere the remonstrations that have been made by Australian officials, the resolution unanimously adopted by the Canadian Parliament and the comments of the Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany? Your answers confirm that the December bombing was directly related to the negotiations.

It is genuinely your expectation that revelation of the negotiating record would lead these allies to accept our use of intensive bombing as an appropriate negotiating tool?

Your answer to my question about the interest of the United States which is at stake in Southeast Asia refers only to our general interest in world stability and order, and in the peaceful resolution of international disputes. Would this interest, in your opinion, warrant involvement in local or regional disputes elsewhere in the world on the scale of our Vietnam involvement? If not, what is there about Southeast Asia that differentiates our interest there from the rest of the world?

Am I correct in understanding that you

would reserve the possibility of resumption of United States military action in Southeast Asia in the event of violations of a settlement agreement?

In all frankness, your answer to my question with regard to the limits on the President's exclusive authority to make war again is also unresponsive. You state that "the President's decisions as Commander-in-Chief are required to be unilateral for only he is designated as Commander-in-Chief." Do you mean to suggest that any and all decisions on military actions in Southeast Asia are exclusively for the President under his Commander-in-Chief power? If not, may I ask again what you regard as the limits?

In addition, if the President has this exclusive power, how do you reconcile this with your statement that "in no other form of Government are the actions of the Chief Executive and Commander-in-Chief so safeguarded as in our Constitutional Republic"?

Does Congressional action in raising and supporting military forces, and in authorizing their overseas deployment, give the President sole power as Commander-in-Chief to determine when and how these forces are to be used?

I commend your candor, although I cannot agree with your reasoning, in stating that our NATO forces should not be reduced while negotiations for mutually balanced force reductions continue. With that premise, however, I would ask, do you expect our NATO allies also to hold the line, or will they continue to reduce their contribution to the NATO defense forces?

I am glad to have your clarification rejecting the "bargaining chip" argument as the basis for force structure decisions and weapons acquisition; and would, of course, agree that our military forces must "be adequate to constitute a sufficient deterrent and to protect our people, if necessary." With such forces, are we not also in a position to negotiate from strength?

You state you do not believe that the United States is a policeman for Southeast Asia. Would you therefore support the position that after the return of our prisoners of war and an accounting for those missing in action, the massive United States military forces that still remain in Southeast Asia should not again be committed to combat there?

To the following questions, I would also appreciate a reply:

Most of the questions raised in the Congress tend to involve our strategic forces; therefore much less attention is devoted to the cost and mission of our conventional, general purpose forces.

In this connection, kindly furnish for the record the amount of the Fiscal Year 1973 budget which is primarily devoted to our NATO commitment, either directly or indirectly.

I note that, as submitted, the budget provided \$8.8 billion for strategic forces and \$25.6 billion for general purpose forces, with the other major programs, such as R&D, Guard and Reserve, etc., constituting the remainder. The cost of our general purpose forces, therefore, is on the order of \$3 as compared to \$1 for our strategic forces. (This assumes, of course, that the remainder of the budget support is in approximately the same proportion as the direct cost of the strategic and general purpose forces. The total requested FY 73 budget authority was \$81.7 billion.)

It is my understanding that most of our general purpose forces are primarily earmarked for the NATO contingency, especially since the Nixon Doctrine excludes the use of land forces in the Far East. I realize that estimates of the NATO cost to this country have varied over the years. Several years ago the Department estimated the annual cost at \$14 billion. This calculation, however, omitted several significant cost items; and a more

recent estimate, by outside sources, has been on the order of \$25 billion annually.

I would ask for your estimate, including all costs—annual costs of the Reserves, now totaling over \$4 billion annually and most of which is ear-marked for NATO use, plus a proper proportion of retired pay, now also amounting to \$5 billion annually, properly attributable to the cost of having maintained the NATO commitment.

This question makes clear that the conventional cost should not be limited to those United States troops which are stationed in NATO.

Sincerely,

STUART SYMINGTON.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, if no one wishes to speak at this moment, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. I thank my distinguished chairman.

I shall be brief, Mr. President. I have not said anything during the course of this debate because I know that the distinguished chairman of the committee is the most able advocate that Mr. Clements can have. But I am delighted to have the opportunity to stand on the floor of the U.S. Senate and urge the confirmation of the nomination of a man such as Bill Clements.

Bill Clements is a self-made man. He has contributed a great deal to the economy of our State. He is one of the great producers in these United States. By "producers" I mean one who has contributed to the economic growth of our country. He is a man who is tough-minded and able, and yet is warm and human and public spirited.

He has a long record of having worked unselfishly for various worthwhile causes. In the State of Texas, he served very ably, at the call of his President, on the blue ribbon defense panel and worked with great diligence on that commission to analyze and try to recommend solutions to the various problems that confront the Department of Defense.

It has been my privilege to know Bill Clements as a community leader, as one interested in public affairs, and to work with him in his capacity as chairman of the board of governors of Southern Methodist University, a post that he now reluctantly relinquishes for the purpose of broader service to his country.

I know of his interest in young people, and that is evidenced by his intensive activity and leadership in the Boy Scouts movement. As one of those concerned with higher education, I have been gratified at his efforts in the interests of privately supported education in the United States. I hope the day never comes when education will be a monopoly of the State. Institutions of higher education these days face a state of financial crisis.

Bill Clements is the kind of man who gives of his own resources financially and of his time and his immense talent and energy to furthering privately supported higher education in this country. I think I would not be remiss in quoting what the president of Southern Methodist University said of Bill Clements' departure from the board of governors. He said, simply, "He will be irreplaceable." It is that kind of irreplaceable man who should fill positions in the Government of the United States.

I certainly can attest to his character and his honesty, and I hope that nothing that has been said here about his financial connections will be interpreted as reflecting on his character or his integrity, because he certainly has proved that he has both. This man is a naturally unselfish servant of his fellow man. I hope we do not get to the point in the U.S. Senate that we ultimately insist that a man virtually pauperize himself for the privilege of serving the people of the United States. The only men who should serve in high positions in Government are those who have already proved themselves to be successful and capable, and we are not going to be able to recruit such men if we insist that they suffer economic punishment every time they agree to serve.

I would note that people who serve in capacities such as that for which Mr. Clements has been nominated have more rigid requirements in terms of conflict of interest than we in the Senate have. What he holds and has been asked to divest himself of, we could legally hold and still vote on vital matters of authorization and appropriation that might favorably influence the economic condition of companies in which we might have securities.

So again I want to commend Mr. Clements for having stripped himself of those things that we have asked him to divest himself of, for his willingness to serve his country, and to express the certain knowledge that he will be a faithful, able, and constructive public servant. I urge the confirmation of his nomination by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining—the time that I control?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, how much time is remaining for the other side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The other side has 32 minutes remaining.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me 10 minutes of his 32 minutes?

Mr. HUGHES. I am happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee such time as he may need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for yielding. I did not hesitate to ask the Senator to yield because I knew he would be happy to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

JAMES R. SCHLESINGER

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, James R. Schlesinger has been nominated by the President to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. He has been serving now since 1971 as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. He was, of course, confirmed by the Senate as a member of that Commission in 1971.

The Committee on Armed Services recommends approval of Mr. Schlesinger's nomination. Twelve of our 15 committee members were recorded in favor of the nomination and there were no dissents. Two members recorded themselves as present; one of them only because he wished to reserve the right to delay certain Presidential nominations, and the other because he was not a committee member at the time the hearings were held.

Mr. Schlesinger has a distinguished record, in Government and in the academic world. He has specialized in the area of national security, and I believe he is well qualified to serve as head of the Central Intelligence Agency and as coordinator for the entire intelligence community.

INDEPENDENT JUDGMENTS

Because of the sensitivity of this position, the hearings on Mr. Schlesinger's nomination were held in executive session. As chairman, I have told the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) that we will try to hold some hearings later in which Mr. Schlesinger can testify publicly—at least at the start.

I want Senators to know now, however, that Mr. Schlesinger has assured us that the intelligence community, under his leadership, will continue to make independent judgments, free of all pressures and influence. He wants to generate intelligence estimates which reflect an honest appraisal of all the data at hand.

To me this is supremely important. I believe the CIA has always sought to produce independent assessments. If our experts ever depart from such an independent course, we are on our way to having no intelligence at all.

Mr. Schlesinger has also assured that he will appear to testify when called before the appropriate Senate and House committees.

What I have said about reports to the President means he is going to report directly to the President and the intelligence community of which he is the leader will make these independent judgments and directly report them. We think that is a highly important principle.

I am satisfied that Mr. Schlesinger is beyond all doubt well qualified to serve in this new position.

From 1969 through 1971 he was with the Bureau of the Budget and the new Office of Management and Budget. As assistant director of the OMB he was responsible for national security activities and international programs.

In that capacity he was intimately acquainted with the operations of the intelligence community. Just before moving to the AEC in 1971 he drafted certain recommendations on those operations which formed the basis for a reorganiza-

January 23, 1973

tion of the intelligence community which was ordered by the President late in 1971.

I am sure this experience will serve him well in his new job. I hope the intelligence community, under his direction, will be able to generate the necessary intelligence for policy makers and eliminate duplication and the gathering of information which is not really needed.

Mr. President, the Central Intelligence Agency, the central part of it, has had a very clean budget and a very conservative budget under retiring Director Helms, who has done an outstanding job. I will have more to say about him later and his fine record. However, the reorganization of all the intelligence community had just been effected. He had not had a chance to get into that very much.

Mr. Schlesinger has given double assurance that he will, under that new plan, get into these additional aspects.

The Armed Services Committee, as is its custom, secured information from Mr. Schlesinger with respect to his financial holdings. He will, of course, not be directly involved in contracting, but he has agreed to divorce himself entirely from dealings with one firm in which he holds stock.

Mr. President, I think it is well known that I have admired the way in which Mr. Richard Helms has carried out his responsibilities as Director of Central Intelligence. I think we are fortunate to have a man of Mr. Schlesinger's qualifications nominated to succeed Mr. Helms. I urge that this nomination be approved by the Senate.

I ask that certain biographical data be printed in the RECORD at this point for the information of Senators.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAMES R. SCHLESINGER

James R. Schlesinger was born in New York City on February 15, 1929. He attended schools in New York, and did college and graduate work at Harvard University from which he received an AB (summa cum laude) in 1950, an MA in 1952, and a PhD in 1956.

Career highlights:

1956-1963—Assistant and associate professor of economics, University of Virginia. During part of that period, he was a Consultant to the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, Consultant to the RAND Corporation, and was the Academic Consultant in Economics to the Naval War College in 1957. His lectures there appeared as a book, "The Political Economy of National Security," in 1960.

1963-1969—Senior staff member and later Director of Strategic Studies, the RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, California. He specialized in strategic analysis with particular reference to nuclear weaponry.

1969-1971—Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget and, subsequently Assistant Director of the Office of Management and Budget. He served as Acting Director of BOB during the transition to OMB. He had responsibility for OMB activities associated with national security and international programs, served as BOB representative on the Environmental Quality Council (predecessor of the present Council on Environmental Quality), and BOB-OMB representative on the Space Council, and on sundry National Security Council committees.

1971-present—Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission Head of U.S. Delegation to the 16th International Atomic Energy Agency General Conference.

Mr. Schlesinger is the author of numerous memoranda and technical articles on national security matters and on monetary, fiscal and labor economics.

He is married to the former Rachel Melinger of Springfield, Ohio. They have eight children and live in Arlington, Virginia.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I repeat for emphasis that we were all impressed with Mr. Schlesinger's background, his fine grasp of problems, his intimate knowledge of those problems, and his overall capability. I think he will do a splendid job. I think it is a very difficult task. It is one of those agencies of Government that has to take the licks and bricks for everything that happens and everything that is said, and keep on doing a good job.

It would be frightening to me to think about us trying to exist in this modern world without a capable Central Intelligence Agency and particularly frightening to think how any human being could even begin to discharge his duties as President of the United States without a capable agency, with an outstanding man at the head of it. I think we have had a man who has done a very outstanding job, and that man is now retiring. I am happy that Mr. Schlesinger will be able to carry on.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD certain portions of the report filed with the Senate on this nomination.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE ACTION

Mr. Schlesinger's nomination was forwarded to the Senate on January 4, 1973, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services on January 8, 1973. This report follows hearings held on January 12, 1973, during which the committee carefully scrutinized the nominee's credentials and qualifications. After full consideration, the committee finds the nominee eminently qualified for the position of Director of Central Intelligence and overwhelmingly recommends that the nomination be confirmed. The committee heard Mr. Schlesinger in executive session on the date noted above and his nomination was thereafter acted on favorably by the committee with 12 members voting in the affirmative, 2 voting present. There were no negative votes. It was agreed to report favorably the nomination of Mr. Schlesinger to the Senate.

QUALIFICATIONS

The nominee is currently serving as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission having been confirmed for that position by the U.S. Senate on August 6, 1971. During his career, Mr. Schlesinger has served in a number of other capacities of national importance. In 1969 and 1971 he was appointed Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget and later became the Acting Director during the transition to the Office of Management and Budget. He has also served on a number of councils and committees of the National Security Council where he occupied positions of leadership and responsibility.

The nominee's biographical sketch as provided to the committee is attached and made a part of this report.

WILLINGNESS TO TESTIFY

During the course of the hearings, Mr. Schlesinger assured the committee that he would willingly appear before the Senate committees when requested to testify as provided for in the resolution of the Senate Democratic conference.

FINANCIAL HOLDINGS

The committee found that Mr. Schlesinger had no securities which would give rise to a conflict of interest with respect to his duties as Director of Central Intelligence.

CONCLUSION

It is the view of the committee that Mr. James R. Schlesinger is thoroughly qualified for the post to which he has been nominated and favorably reports that nomination. The committee recommends the nominee's confirmation by the U.S. Senate.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF JAMES R. SCHLESINGER

James R. Schlesinger was born in New York City on February 15, 1929. He attended schools in New York and did college and graduate work at Harvard University from which he received an AB (summa cum laude) in 1950, an MA in 1952, and a Ph. D. in 1956.

Career highlights

1956-63 Assistant and associate professor of economics, University of Virginia. During part of that period, he was a consultant to the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, consultant to the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, consultant to the Rand Corp., and was the Academic Consultant in Economics to the Naval War College in 1957. His lectures there appeared as a book, "The Political Economy of National Security," in 1960.

1963-69: Senior staff member and later Director of Strategic Studies, the Rand Corp., Santa Monica, Calif. He specialized in strategic analysis with particular reference to nuclear weaponry.

1969-71: Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget and, subsequently Assistant Director of the Office of Management and Budget. He served as Acting Director of BOB during the transition to OMB. He had responsibility for OMB activities associated with national security and international programs, served as BOB representative on the Environmental Quality Council (predecessor of the present Council on Environmental Quality), and BOB-OMB representative on the Space Council, and on sundry National Security Council committees.

1971-present: Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, Head of U.S. delegation to the 16th International Atomic Energy Agency General Conference.

Mr. Schlesinger is the author of numerous memorandums and technical articles on national security matters and on monetary, fiscal, and labor economics.

He is married to the former Rachel Melinger of Springfield, Ohio. They have eight children and live in Arlington, Va.

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield now to anyone who wishes to speak either for or against the nomination.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, have Mr. Clements and Mr. Schlesinger indicated their willingness to appear before the Senator's committee or other committees when reasonably and, to use the words of the distinguished Republican leader, seasonably requested?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. That is covered in my opening statement. It was covered in the open hearings. Both of them clearly and willingly responded that they were willing when called to come in and testify.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad the Senator raised that point.

I am glad to yield now to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. I commend him for the fine leadership he has exhibited in holding hearings in fairness and in justice and I am sure that it will inure to the benefit of the American public.

Mr. President, I rise to support the nomination of Mr. Schlesinger to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. We have had a lot of people come before the Committee on Armed Services during my 18 years in the Senate, and I think that one of the most impressive men I have ever known to appear before that committee is Dr. James R. Schlesinger. He is now chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. He is a man of great ability and learning. He graduated from Harvard summa cum laude and he later received his masters degree and his doctors degree.

He has had experience in government in various capacities. He served as Assistant Director of the Budget, and during the transition period to the Office of Management and Budget, he acted as Director. He served on a number of councils and commissions and on the National Security Council.

In my judgment, it would be difficult for the President to locate a more able, a more experienced, and a better qualified person to serve as Director of the CIA.

This is a most sensitive position. It is a most important position. In fact, almost the life of the Nation depends upon not only our preparedness to meet an attack, but the information we receive as to what is going on in countries as to whether we will probably have an attack. The CIA is extremely important for that reason.

Dr. Schlesinger has signified his willingness to appear before committees, as stated by the chairman in response to the question of the distinguished majority leader. His testimony showed he had no securities which presented any conflict of interest.

The nominee's excellent background will enable him to perform as an effective coordinator of the intelligence community. His demonstrated managerial qualities will also be valuable in the management of the secret apparatus of the CIA. Hopefully, he can do away with any duplication which may now exist within the intelligence communities.

Mr. President, the nominee succeeds Richard Helms, who has performed with distinction in the high post of CIA Director. The nation owes Mr. Helms a debt of gratitude for the outstanding service he has rendered as CIA Director during the past 7 years. In closing, I hope the Senate will promptly confirm the nomination of Mr. Schlesinger as I feel he will be a credit to our Nation and will discharge his responsibilities to this office with great credit to himself, in addition.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may need.

As the Senator from Iowa indicated earlier, he rises in support of the appointment of Dr. Schlesinger as Director of the CIA. The Senator from Iowa is indeed troubled many times about what condition world order seems to be

in our lifetime, but in the order of the world today, with continued utilization of war as a political instrument for settling the differences between different segments of humanity on the earth, whether divided by region or by country, it seems to me that, in the interest of our society and our country, it is necessary to maintain such an instrumentality as the Central Intelligence Agency.

The control of such an agency is extremely important. The knowledge of what is being undertaken around the world by such an agency, both inside various countries of the earth and between the countries of the earth, is extremely important.

It has been hinted in the past that the involvement of this agency in the rise and fall of governments in various continents of the world has been a matter of common practice, that the wielding of influence to governments that are friendly to this Nation that we all love dearly is one of the prime purposes of its existence, that the gathering of information on present and potential adversaries of this Nation is of exceeding importance to the security of the Nation as well as to the balance of power in other areas of the world where international differences may exist between nations.

The potential to disrupt, to do wrong as well as good, exists in such an agency. The potential to sow the seeds of future wars may even exist in such an agency unless handled carefully by the best minds, the best consciences, and the best hearts that this country can produce.

The CIA has been known as the private intelligence eye of the President of the United States, an office that we all respect. It has the unilateral capability of conducting many affairs—most affairs—of which the people of this country will never be aware, that will never be disclosed to them. This being a democracy, a free society, they rely on the leadership of Congress to make determinations, as well as the President of the United States, in his conscience, in the direction of the affairs of our Nation.

The purpose and the reason for the Senator from Iowa's saying this today is to point out simply the fact that in an agency that seems absolutely essential to our survival as a free people, that has such great potential not only for security but for harm unless handled wisely, with conscience and political direction, and with moral concern for the survival of the human race, we must have the best that we can give and respect and honor.

I sat through the hearings on Dr. Schlesinger. This Senator was not familiar with this man in the past, but I was completely impressed with his directness and willingness to respond. The hearings that were held probably will not be disclosed to the public, though the Senator from Iowa wishes they would be, because it is the common practice not to disclose such hearings. But even in the dark recesses of secrecy there must be light, control, efficiency, and respect, and that is the kind of man or woman we are reaching for in this capacity continuously. It is my belief that the President has found such a man. It is my hope

from the bottom of the heart that that belief is correct.

I think it would be important to this body to know that in the questioning there arose occasion to ask if this agency had ever been involved in the surveillance of public officials in this country, and the answer was direct, Dr. Schlesinger had been assured that the agency was never engaged in such activities, and he further stated he guaranteed that as long as he was Director they never would be engaged in such activities.

Such cannot be stated for other intelligence-gathering communities in our country. I hope they would take note of this practice, which is not only prevented by law but by common practice, and as they also have recently assured us that they are not doing, that they would guarantee the privacy and freedom of public officials, both elected and appointed, and all the people I read some recent history of our world for the past quarter of a century, I think I see the importance of this agency and of the ability of people in it to protect the future of our Nation. As our society advances and its capability for destruction advances and the delicate instrument of peace may be threatened and it becomes more important to protect ourselves against total destruction, the need for a man in this office with the greatest respect and integrity that can be found within the boundaries of our country increases proportionately.

The Senator from Iowa hopes we have such a man, and in fact believes that we have, and that is the reason he is supporting this nomination.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, let me say in passing that I know this is the first time in some while that there has been debate on the floor with reference to the financial holdings of gentlemen who are nominated to some of these offices. It is a wholesome thing to have such matters come out and explained. It is well to explain the committee's activities in this field.

I want to mention that many of these men are disposing of certain holdings and, in doing so, are making a considerable sacrifice in money by selling stock they would not otherwise have to sell.

I point out that it does not have to involve the sale of much stock to mean that a person would have to pay \$50,000 in taxes on the profits.

I just mention those things in passing. That is one reason why we try to work out something that is reasonable and safe and logical and so that it will not require the nominee to be stripped to the bare bones financially and be forced to give up everything that he has pertaining to his family security.

The membership of the committee, since I have been serving on it, has been very reasonable in that respect. The members of the committee are very reasonable in performing one of their important functions in connection with this responsibility.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that there is a little more time here than we are actually going to have to use on these matters.

Mr. President, I note that it is only

10 minutes until the announced time for the vote. If no one wishes any time, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi or the Senator from Iowa yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield the distinguished Senator from West Virginia such time as he may require.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed with the consideration of the nominations for the Department of Agriculture at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry (Mr. TALMADGE) as to whether or not the committee has been given a satisfactory understanding from the nominees that they would appear before the committee and testify at the request of the committee in the future?

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I will say in response to the inquiry of the distinguished acting majority leader that I personally asked Mr. William W. Ervin, of Indiana, Mr. Clayton Yeutter, of Nebraska, and Mr. John Knebel, of Virginia, whether in the event the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry desired their presence for any reason, they would appear, and each answered in the affirmative.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. And the chairman and the committee were satisfied completely on that point?

Mr. TALMADGE. The chairman and the committee were satisfied to the extent that we reported all three nominations to the Senate unanimously.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM P. CLEMENTS, JR., TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE AND NOMINATION OF JAMES R. SCHLESINGER TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Rhode Island such time as he may require.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, first of all I want to compliment the President of the United States and also the committee for their action on the nomination of James R. Schlesinger to become the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. I did not know Jim Schlesinger until he became the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. I must say that I have never met a man with greater talent and more dedication, or better qualified to carry out that function. I am happy that the committee has seen fit to endorse the nomination, and I shall vote for its confirmation.

Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Tennessee would like to have the floor for just a moment before the vote, which is scheduled to take place in approximately a minute and a half. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee and wish I had more time.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding to me so that I may add my endorsement and support to that of many others who have expressed support for the two nominees today.

Mr. President, I know both men and have known them over a period of time in an official capacity and also personally. I feel that they are both eminently well qualified and well suited to the jobs they are about to undertake.

I might mention one special thought about Mr. Schlesinger who served with such distinction as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I have had occasion to deal with Mr. Schlesinger on a number of difficult and complex issues. He is a dedicated public servant and will bring great dignity and efficiency to the administration of the job he is about to undertake. I commend the President for his choices in both respects, and I shall happily support their confirmation.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, what is the pending order of business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr.

BARTLETT). The hour of 4 p.m. having arrived, and pursuant to the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to vote on the nomination of William P. Clements, Jr., of Texas, to be a Deputy Secretary of Defense in the Department of Defense.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi will state it.

Mr. STENNIS. Those in favor of the nomination of Mr. Clements to be Deputy Secretary of Defense will vote "yea," and those opposed will vote "nay"; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON), and the Senator from California (Mr. TUNNEY) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. HUDDLESTON) is absent because of a death in the family.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON) would vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Mr. BEALL) is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 74, nays 11, as follows:

[No. 2 Ex.]
YEAS—74

Alken	Curtis	Kennedy
Allen	Dole	Long
Baker	Domenici	McClellan
Bartlett	Dominick	McClure
Bellmon	Eagleton	McGee
Bennett	Eastland	McIntyre
Bentsen	Ervin	Metcalf
Bible	Fannin	Montoya
Biden	Fong	Moss
Brock	Griffin	Muskie
Brooke	Gurney	Nunn
Burdick	Hansen	Packwood
Byrd	Hart	Pastore
Harry F., Jr.	Haskell	Pearson
Cannon	Hatfield	Pell
Case	Helms	Percy
Chiles	Hruska	Randolph
Clark	Humphrey	Roth
Cook	Jackson	Saxbe
Cotton	Javits	Schweiker
Cranston	Johnston	Scott, Pa.

S 1152

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

January 23, 1973

Sen. Va.
Sparkman
Stafford
Stennis

Symington
Taft
Talmadge
Thurmond

Tower
Weicker
Williams
Young

[No. 3 Ex.]
YEAS—85

Abourezk

Eastland

Montoya

Aiken

Ervin

Moss

Baker

Fannin

Muskie

Bartlett

Fong

Nelson

Bellmon

Fulbright

Nunn

Bennett

Gravel

Packwood

Bentsen

Griffin

Pastore

Bible

Gurney

Pearson

Biden

Hansen

Pell

Brook

Hart

Percy

Brooke

Haskell

Proxmire

Burdick

Hatfield

Randolph

Byrd

Hathaway

Roth

Harry F. Jr.

Helms

Saxbe

Byrd, Robert C.

Hruska

Schweiker

Cannon

Hughes

Scott, Pa.

Case

Humphrey

Scott, Va.

Chiles

Javits

Sparkman

Church

Johnston

Stafford

Cook

Kennedy

Stennis

Cotton

Long

Symington

Cranston

Mansfield

Taft

Curtis

McClellan

Talmadge

Doie

McClure

Thurmond

Domenici

McGee

Tower

Dominick

McIntyre

Weicker

Eagleton

Metcalf

Williams

Mondale

Young

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—15

Bayh

Beall

Buckley

Goldwater

Hartke

Hollings

Huddleston

Inouye

Magnuson

Mathias

McGovern

Ribicoff

Stevens

Stevenson

Tunney

So the nomination of William P. Clements, Jr., of Texas, to be a Deputy Secretary of Defense in the Department of Defense, was confirmed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the nomination was confirmed.

Mr. THURMOND. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President of the United States be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senate will now proceed to vote on the nomination of Mr. Schlesinger. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Mr. James R. Schlesinger to be Director of Central Intelligence? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON), the Senator from California (Mr. TUNNEY) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. HUDDLESTON), is absent because of a death in the family.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), would vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Mr. BEALL) is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 85, nays 0, as follows:

So the nomination of James R. Schlesinger, of Virginia, to be Director of Central Intelligence, was confirmed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote whereby the nomination was confirmed.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be so notified.)

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD M. HELMS ON HIS RETIREMENT AS DIRECTOR OF THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, we have rarely had a chance to talk about Mr. Helms here since he has been the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. One such matter arose in connection with an amendment to an appropriations bill. I remember that we had a debate that night. The late senior Senator from Louisiana, Mr. Ellender, the chairman of our Appropriations Committee, and several of us had worked on that budget for years. We brought out then the outstanding work that Mr. Helms had done.

Mr. Helms has served for 6 years as the Director of the CIA. He is the first one who came up through the ranks. He has been in the intelligence work and in the Central Intelligence Agency since it was created. He came all the way up and was nominated 6 years ago by the

late President Lyndon Johnson. He served with distinction.

Frankly, I was disappointed when I heard he was going to retire. My statement does not relate in any way to the ability of Mr. Schlesinger. I have already stated he is an outstanding man. I have said this even before I knew who his successor might be.

Mr. President, 6 years is a long enough time to carry the load and responsibility of being the Director of the CIA and carrying the things in his head that only he knows. They are not written anywhere, many of them. He is aware of disturbing things, that come to him, upon which he has to make a judgment.

It is not altogether a thankless task. However, we do not have an opportunity to realize what all of these men undergo and the load they carry. Still they have to smile and keep quiet when someone attacks them, and those attacks come largely because the person who attacks them does not know all the facts.

I want to say a word of appreciation today for the outstanding job, performed over more than 6 years, by Mr. Helms as Director of Central Intelligence—a position which includes responsibility for administration of the Central Intelligence Agency and for coordination of the entire intelligence community. And that includes the other agencies of the Government that are engaged in the collection of intelligence information as well as those partially passing on it.

I also want to pay a personal tribute to Mr. Helms. He has spent a lifetime in the intelligence business—a business that is different, uncertain, difficult and greatly misunderstood at times by many. Nevertheless, this splendid official leaves his job with a richly deserved reputation for personal integrity.

Mr. President, I emphasize that matter of personal integrity and all of the ups and downs and shifts in stands and changes of climate as well as changes made in the intelligence climate in terms of war and otherwise.

Mr. Helms has handled one of the Nation's most difficult jobs and handled it exceedingly well. Moreover, he has set a precedent by showing that a career intelligence officer can aspire to—and fill—the top intelligence job in the Nation—in fact the top job of its kind in the world.

Mr. Helms began his intelligence career in World War II. He joined the Central Intelligence Agency when it was established on September 18, 1947, after service with predecessor organizations. In CIA he rose to Deputy to the Deputy Director for Plans, and, in 1962 to Deputy Director for Plans.

He was named Director of Central Intelligence by President Johnson in June 1966. Renominated by President Nixon in 1969, he has served under two Presidents, one a Democrat and one a Republican.

Under the direction of Mr. Helms, CIA has applied itself to the gathering and analysis of intelligence. Policymaking

OF M DCI

January 23, 1973

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 1237

James H. McGee
Edward R. Miller
James L. Morton
Frank W. Mott
Robert G. Neely
Joseph O. Ortiz
Angelo S. Parise
Ronald L. Phillips
William L. Pope
Joseph Ribeiro
Clifford Robinson
James L. Rodak
Stephen L. Shivers

Theodore F. Singley
James A. Sorley
Joseph Thorpe
Frederick H. Trout
Albert L. Wade
Rufus J. Washington
Leonard R. Webb
Richard L. Wheeler
Richard H. White
Warren W. Winter
Anthony P. Witek
Billy W. Woodard

Dotterrer, David G.
Dunnigan, James A.
Elliott, John R.
Ellis, Dan S.
Elwood, Hugh T.
Everman, Vincent P., Jr.
Field, Alan J.
Fleming, Ronald R.
Forney, James C.
Fraser, William B.
Freeman, Mark P.
Galati, David A.
Gapco, Brian S.
Gardner, Emerson N., Jr.

Gardner, Michael W.
Gisolo, Gary G.
Goldenstein, John P.
Good, Alvin L.
Grossman, Stanley L.
Groves, David A.
Hennebeck, Lawrence M.
Hicks, Harry H., Jr.
Hoffer, Nicholas J.
Jackson, Roger L.
Jackson, Wesley T.
Jones, Henry L.
Karnath, Michael W.
Kay, Thomas G.
Koger, Thomas H.
Leader, Charles A., III
Leavis, James M.
Lemoine, John A.
Lennox, Dyer T.

Lever, Brian P.
Lillenthal, John M.
Linnehan, William F.
Long, Jerry E.
Lotito, James C.
Lund, Daniel E.
Martinez, Arthur
McAfee, John M.
McCabe, John M.
McCormick, John
McGinnis, Edward E.
McGuigan, Edward A.
Metcalf, Michael B.
Minerich, Jon T.
Mulholand, James M.
Murphy, Daniel J.
Mutzig, Steven M.
Naster, Mark H.
Natonski, Richard F.
Naughton, James P.
Nelsen, Rex E.
O'Brien, Edward J.
O'Hara, William F., Jr.
Parlova, Erling M.
Patrick, Wayne A.
Peck, Ronald W.
Peterson, Harris-Clichy, Jr.
Peterson, Mark A.
Pickelsimer, Douglas E.
Pillifant, Cleve B.
Pollitt, Mark M.
Propst, Rodney N.
Roach, Jay W.
Roan, Richard W.

Roth, Richard R.
Schmid, Joseph H.
Schmidt, Richard F., Jr.
Schmitt, Robert L.
Schneider, Steven L.
Schwartzel, Joseph H.
Shipman, Larry K.
Shirk, James L.
Smith, Floyd R., Jr.
Sonnenberg, Steven B.
Sorley, James M.
Stevens, Stanley W.
Stolz, Richard A.
Stone, Jacob F., Jr.

Strong, John M.
Suenaga, Jerry L.
Swanson, Clifford R.
Tatone, Don W.
Thoman, Mark C.
Thomiszser, Thomas H.
Thompson, David L.
Tucker, Robert K.
Vanhaute, Edward B.
Voss, James P.
Walliser, Thomas A.
Watson, William P.
Wilson, Timothy T.
Wismer, Lance
Yoder, Billy Q.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps) graduates for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Adams, David L.
Adang, Thomas C.
Aldridge, Michael E.
Anderson, James E.
Anderson, Wilbur C.
Andres, Paul A.
Bach, Robert M.
Bailey, Hudson L.
Barrett, John A.
Bean, Richard A.
Beckhart, Paul E.
Behl, Brian L.
Bohnker, Bruce K.
Bonkoski, Edward J.
Boone, Michael J.
Bray, Philip E.
Burzak, Jay E.
Butcher, Donald R.
Carter, Brett M.
Clark, John T., III
Clark, William M. H.
Collyer, Kenneth L.
Corman, James M.
Cummins, Thomas J.
Cuny, Terrence J.
Curtiss, Daniel E.
Dahlen, Glenn E.
Dalton, Joseph F., Jr.
Deremiah, Richard E.
Dinehart, Duane A.
Dinwiddie, Brian S.
Dohring, Paul E.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 23, 1973:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

William W. Erwin, of Indiana, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.
Clayton Yeutter, of Nebraska, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.
John A. Knebel, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

William P. Clements, Jr., of Texas, to be a Deputy Secretary of Defense.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

James R. Schlesinger, of Virginia, to be Director of Central Intelligence.

In case not 6an

Approved For Release 2005/06/06 : CIA-RDP75B00380R000400150018-7
THE EVENING STAR

DATE 21 MAR 73 PAGE 1

CIA Begins Big Cut in Force

By SEYMOUR M. HERSH
New York Times News Service

James R. Schlesinger, the new director of the Central Intelligence Agency, has begun the largest personnel cutback in the history of the agency.

Unofficial CIA sources estimated that at least 1,000 — and possibly as many as 1,800 — of the agency's approximately 18,000 jobs will be abolished by June 30.

In addition Schlesinger is expected to continue cutbacks in other intelligence agencies too, such as the huge National Security Agency and the Defense Agency.

An official agency source acknowledged that what he termed a "reduction in force" — known in the government as a RIF—is under way "on a very selective basis" to eliminate "marginal performers." But he would give no figures.

No official announcement of the cutbacks has been made to employees at CIA headquarters in Langley, Va.

"This is the first place I've ever been in where all the rumors come true, one agency employee said. "You get a call and get an interview and that's it," he said, describing the job-elimination process.

In addition to the layoffs, Schlesinger has initiated a high-level shakeup of key management positions inside the agency.

He reportedly has been told by President Nixon to improve the efficiency of the nation's

over-all intelligence operations, which cost more than \$6 billion a year.

The CIA's Office of Research and Development in Rosslyn is said to be particularly affected. The office is responsible for most of the agency's basic research projects. The official CIA source, however, described the cuts as being "across the board" and not limited to any specific office.

The Associated Press quoted sources as saying that reports of a 10 percent reduction at CIA are high. In some cases, sources told AP, some employees have been transferred to other jobs, and some administrative personnel have been reshuffled.

A former high-level official expressed surprise when told of the large-scale personnel cutbacks. "The CIA doesn't have RIF's," he said. "That's

always been considered a security risk."

The only significant cutback in the agency's history took place shortly after John J. McCone was named director in 1961 by President Kennedy, a few months after the aborted Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba. About 260 agents employed by the agency's clandestine service were eliminated then, the former official said, "and that was very carefully handled."

THE WASHINGTON POST

DATE **4 MAR 73** PAGE **1**

CIA's Schlesinger Begins Streamlining Operations

By Thomas O'Toole
Washington Post Staff Writer

The new director of the Central Intelligence Agency has begun the long-promised reorganization of the vast U.S. intelligence community with an eye toward streamlining his own agency and bringing military intelligence under closer civilian control.

At the peak of the Vietnam war, the U.S. intelligence community employed 150,000 persons and spent \$6 billion a year, a growth that led to duplication, inter-agency bickering and jurisdictional jealousies that horrified President Nixon.

In his first month as director, James R. Schlesinger has moved three choices of his own into top jobs at the CIA, forced out two mem-

bers of the old guard and set about the task of bringing under CIA control the three other federal services that with the CIA make up the bulk of the U.S. intelligence network.

This description of Schlesinger's first month as CIA director came from an authoritative source, who said that Schlesinger is acting on the personal instructions of the President. It was Schlesinger who directed a massive study of the intelligence community when he was a member of the Office of Management and Budget in 1971, just before he became chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Paring of the Defense Department's intelligence activities began even before Schlesinger moved into the CIA. Manpower at the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency and the intelligence branches of the four armed services had climbed above 100,000 persons at one point. In addition, 50,000 others were scattered through 10 other agencies.

One source on Capitol Hill said that \$1 billion had been cut from the budget of the Defense Intelligence Agency alone, a figure that was disputed in size only by another source.

"It wasn't that much of a cut," the source said, "but it was a good-sized bite."

Since becoming director, Schlesinger has made five key moves in his attempts to strengthen the CIA, which one source said was suffer-

ing from "aging and bureaucratization."

Schlesinger appointed William E. Colby as deputy director of plans, which is the CIA title for the man who heads the agency's covert espionage operations or "department of dirty tricks." Now 53 years old, Colby was at one time head of the U.S. pacification program in South Vietnam.

Colby replaced Thomas Karamessines, who had wanted to retire two years ago but

who stayed on at the insistence of the White House. One published report said that Karamessines had been fired by Schlesinger, but sources close to the CIA insisted this was incorrect.

The new CIA director also pulled a pair of generals out of the Pentagon to serve on the newly formed Intelligence Resource Advisory Committee. They are Army Maj. Gen. Daniel O. Graham and Air Force Maj. Gen. Lew Allen, both of whom

have served in military intelligence and knew Schlesinger who had admired them since his own days with the Rand Corp.

"Jim [Schlesinger] is a takeover kind of guy," one source said, "and these appointments bring in men he feels comfortable with, who will back him up when the going gets tough."

The going is expected to get tough quite soon, since it is understood that Schlesinger plans a complete

overhauling of the CIA. One source described the CIA as an "old boy network" that had been allowed to grow unchecked since it was created by President Truman in 1947. The CIA now employs 15,000 persons and has a budget of \$600 million a year.

Schlesinger has already forced two old CIA hands into early retirement. One is Bronson Tweedy, former deputy to Schlesinger's predecessor, Richard M

Helms. The other is Thomas Parrott, a deputy to Tweedy who had been at the CIA since 1961.

Schlesinger is said to believe that the CIA must shift gears now that there is a cease-fire in Vietnam. He is said to think that the Middle East should now be the focus of CIA attention, particularly since the Soviet Union is understood to be moving some of its activities out of the Mediterranean and into the Persian Gulf.

The new CIA director is also said to believe that the CIA ought to change its role with the changing times. One source said that Schlesinger believes the CIA must begin to gather more intelligence about international crime, terrorism and narcotics traffic.

"The international terrorist movement is something that Schlesinger feels should be watched far more closely," the source said. "There are some peo-

ple in intelligence who say it's going to take a major effort to keep these terrorists out of the U.S., to keep them from assassinating public figures right here on American soil."

Schlesinger is also said to be concerned about public opinion of the CIA and the role of espionage in an increasingly critical world society.

"I think Jim would like it if the American public had a greater understanding of the need for intelligence," one source said. "I don't think he believes he can get the job done right if there is hostility and opposition to the CIA because it's thought to be a nest of spies."

Richard Helms' departure from the CIA was said to be as much of a sign of change at the CIA as Schlesinger's arrival. Helms presided over the CIA for the past seven years, during which time the United States was caught in a series of intelligence failures.

The loss of the Pueblo, the loss of a U.S. reconnaissance plane in North Korea right after the Pueblo disaster, the abortive raid on the Sontay prisoners-of-war camp in North Vietnam are all cited as failures of U.S. intelligence. The lack of intelligence about North Vietnam's invasion of Cambodia in 1970 and of its offensive in South Vietnam a year ago are also cited as examples of an intelligence community grown too bureaucratic.

While Helms was admired for his tough-mindedness, he was also viewed with suspicion by the Nixon White House for his independence and his alliances in Washington society.

His power base in Congress, his friendship with Washington columnists and his socializing at Georgetown cocktail parties were all frowned upon in the White House, where a low profile is admired more than standing in society.